



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

1952

An evaluation of merit rating as a factor in the promotion of Naval officers to the top management level.

Rittenhouse, E. B.

Ohio State University

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/14160>

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>

AN EVALUATION OF MERIT RATING AS A FACTOR
IN THE PROMOTION OF NAVAL OFFICERS
TO THE TOP MANAGEMENT LEVEL

By

Cdr. E. B. RITTENHOUSE, USN, 73309
The Ohio State University
1952

THE
R58
SIS

Library
U. S. Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	General	1
	Scope of Study	5
	Terminology	6
	The Problem	9
	The Solution	10
	Methodology	11
II	MERIT RATING	13
	History	13
	General	15
	Why Use Merit Rating?	17
	What Does Merit Rating Do?	19
	When Use Merit Rating?	20
III	TYPES OF MERIT RATING	23
	Rating Scales	24
	Comparison Systems	27
	Check Lists	32
	Objectives Versus Merit Rating Plans.	36
IV	CAUTIONS, DANGERS AND PRINCIPLES OF MERIT RATING	38
	The Rater	38
	Validity	42
	Rating Form Design	43
	Principles of Merit Rating	45
V	THE NAVY FITNESS REPORT	50
	History	50
	Revising a Fitness Report	51
	Features of the Current Fitness Report	55
	Purpose	57
	Weight Given Fitness Reports in Se- lection for Promotion	58

Table of Contents (con't)

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
VI MERIT RATING IN INDUSTRY	60
VII COMPARISON OF NAVAL AND INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AND PROMOTION PROBLEMS	66
VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	73
Evaluation of Fitness Report	73
A. Rating Form Design - a Comparison	73
B. Principles of Merit Rating - a Comparison	77
Conclusions	83
Recommendations	86
APPENDIX A	90
APPENDIX B	93
APPENDIX C	94
APPENDIX D	95
APPENDIX E	97
APPENDIX F	99
APPENDIX G	101
APPENDIX H	103
APPENDIX I	105
APPENDIX J	107
APPENDIX K	111
APPENDIX L	113
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117

AN EVALUATION OF MERIT RATING AS A FACTOR IN THE PROMOTION OF NAVAL OFFICERS TO THE TOP MANAGEMENT LEVEL

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The subject of promotion of executives to top level responsibilities has been chosen because not too much information is available on what appears to be an extremely important matter. If promotion of inadequate executives is taking place, industrial as well as naval, society is not getting the service to which it is entitled. Usually, the general public does not become cognizant of this fact until a poor decision results in an unsatisfactory product, unfavorable publicity, disaster for a segment of society, or other misfortune.

Whether or not a decision was based on sound thinking processes may have little or no effect on public reaction, if the ultimate result is bad. In this case, a qualified executive will, in all probability, have to be replaced because of adverse public opinion. In industry, this takes the form of refusal by the public to buy the product or ac-

THE EVALUATION OF MERIT RATING AS A FACTOR IN THE
PROMOTION OF NAVAL OFFICERS TO THE TOP MANAGEMENT LEVEL

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The subject of promotion or exoneration to top level
responsibilities has been chosen because not too much in-
formation is available on what appears to be an extremely
important matter. It consists of inadequate knowledge
in many cases. Industry as well as naval service is
not getting the service to which it is entitled. Finally,
the general public does not become cognizant of this fact
until a poor decision results in an unsatisfactory product,
unfavorable publicity, disaster for a segment of industry,
or other misfortune.

Whether or not a decision was based on sound thinking
processes may have little or no effect on public reaction,
if the ultimate result is bad. In this case, a qualified
executive will, in all probability, have to be replaced be-
cause of adverse public opinion. In industry, this causes
the loss of talent by the public to buy the product or ac-

cept the service offered. In the Armed Services, the reaction is apt to be more immediate and direct. In either case a fully qualified replacement must be available.

The chances of an unqualified executive reaching a position of top level responsibility will be greatly reduced, and the chances of having a qualified relief for the present executive will be greatly increased, if the best possible system of selection for promotion is in effect. All executives have to be replaced sometime, whether their going is voluntary or involuntary, so that it is common sense to be prepared for the inevitable. The best possible system of selection for promotion today is a partial answer, but not the final one. Any such system must be kept in continuous overhaul.

As Muller-Thym and Salveson have pointed out,¹ promotion is not the sole objective of individual success. Men do have a limit to their capacities. To attempt to operate beyond that point is similar to the pilot who flies above his ceiling without oxygen. The higher he goes the less effective he becomes. "Growth, as well as promotion is the goal, and it should be made clear that a man and his

¹ Bernard J. Muller-Thym and Melvin E. Salveson. "Developing Executives for Business Leadership," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 25, No. 4, January 1949, p. 252.

...the system will be greatly improved, if the best possible system of selection for promotion is in effect. All executives have to be replaced eventually, whether they come to the top voluntarily or involuntarily, so that it is essential to be prepared for the inevitable. The best possible system of selection for promotion today is a partial answer, but not the final one. Any such system must be kept in

the world, and it should be made clear that a man and his
attitude be known. "Growth, as well as production is
his willing without oxygen. The algae he gets the life
beyond some point is similar to the color and life shown
to have a limit to their capacities. To attempt to operate
him is not the role of objective of individual interest. The
as Wilson-Tyler and Sullivan have pointed out, I agree.

1. Edward J. Miller-Tyler and Melvin E. Halperin,
"Developing Executives for Business Leadership," Personnel
Mag. Vol. 22, January 1945, p. 232.

job can grow considerably without necessitating an actual job change."¹ This is undoubtedly true, yet the goal of promotion is so far beyond the goal of growth as to be almost entered in a different race. Rexford Hersey² states as his belief that there are few individuals who cannot be improved from an efficiency standpoint, if the improvement is undertaken gradually. The fact that men with plenty of capacity remaining untapped can, nevertheless, be pushed too fast is not to be mistaken for lack of capacity in the same sense. Men in this latter case are still working on the upward slope of learning ability; whereas men in the first instance are mentally at, or near, their upper limit for absorbing new ideas, but still are capable of doing with more efficiency those things already learned. It is doubtful whether the executive in the Navy or in industry, who is being considered for promotion to the top level, should be selected for that promotion if he is in the category where his ability limit has been reached but his efficiency can be improved gradually. The problem at that point is to keep morale high and obtain the benefit of all

¹ Muller-Thym and Salveson, op. cit., p. 252.

² Rexford Hersey. "Individualized Executive Selection, Training, and Follow-Up," Personnel Series No. 89, AMA, 1945. p. 6.

[illegible]

1
J. Edgar Hoover and Raymond, pp. 111, p. 112.

1. General - The following information is being furnished to you for your information and is not to be used for any other purpose.

the ability the executive possesses by utilizing his full capacity at a worthwhile job.¹

Primarily, the problem is to select for promotion the best of a group of executives, each of whom has adequate ability. When prospective promotees are being considered for promotion by a selection board whose members have not necessarily had occasion to work with them, a written picture of each person to be considered is necessary. This is the situation in the Navy and might also be applicable to any large concern with several establishments at distant locations.

McMurry defines selection as "nothing more nor less than the matching of the applicant's qualifications against the requirements of the job."² If that selection is for promotion, the requirements of the new job will be the criteria. It can be visualized that the accomplishment of a system of selection for promotion will require:

¹ For a further discussion on capacity versus promotion see

Harvey G. Ellerd. "Rating Supervisors," Production Executive Series No. 42, AMA, 1926. p. 17.

² Robert N. McMurry. "Is it Management's Fault that so many Salesmen Fail?" Sales Management, August 15, 1951. p. 106.

For further discussion of this subject see

Richard A. Fear. "Employee Selection for the Average Company," Personnel Series No. 100, AMA, 1946. p. 3ff.

the ability to accept the position of assistant

and to be a member of the

organization. The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

shall be subject to the same conditions as the

other members of the organization.

The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

shall be subject to the same conditions as the

other members of the organization.

and to be a member of the

organization. The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

shall be subject to the same conditions as the

other members of the organization.

The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

shall be subject to the same conditions as the

other members of the organization.

The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

shall be subject to the same conditions as the

other members of the organization.

The position is to be held for a period of

one year or more, and the person who is appointed

(1) the development of descriptive personnel records, (2) adequate training for every job with sufficient emphasis on development for the job ahead, (3) a knowledge of the requirements of the job ahead, and (4) definite allocations of responsibility for selecting individuals for promotion.¹ Undoubtedly, as Mace says, "a thoroughgoing appraisal of the people in an organization provides the basis for doing a better job in making selections for promotion,"² but to complete the picture requires a consideration of the job to be done. In the course of this study the extent to which merit rating is used to accomplish requirements (1), (2) and (3) will be discussed.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The scope of this work will be limited to one small facet of promotion -- the use of merit rating in determining the best executives for top administrative responsibilities in the Navy. In order to provide some comparison, industrial practices along similar lines will also be discussed from time to time. Furthermore, although promotion is made

¹ Helen Baker. Company Plans for Employee Promotion. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1939. p. 10.

² Myles L. Mace. The Growth and Development of Executives. Boston: Harvard University, 1950. p. 50.

(1) the development of constructive personnel policies, (2) advanced training for every job with sufficient emphasis on development for the job ahead, (3) a knowledge of the requirements of the job ahead, and (4) definite plans of responsibility for selecting individuals for promotion. Undoubtedly, as these steps, "a photographing" of the people in the organization provides the basis for doing a better job in making selections for promotion, but to complete the picture requires a consideration of the job to be done. In the course of this study for extent to which work itself is used to accomplish results (1), (2) and (3) will be discussed.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The scope of this work will be limited to one small group of personnel -- the use of work itself in determining the best selection for the administrative responsibilities in the Navy. In order to provide some comparison, industrial practices along similar lines will also be discussed from time to time. Furthermore, although personnel is made

¹ Walter Dill Taylor, Company Plans for Employee Promotion, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1933, p. 10.

² Leta I. Taylor, The Growth and Development of the Employee, Boston: Harvard University, 1930, p. 30.

continuously in the Navy and industry, only that portion applicable to naval officers being considered for flag rank and to industrial executives being considered for top management will be discussed in any detail. Merit rating has some other uses than for promotion, but, beyond listing some of these, no study will be made of them. Source material will be limited to that available in the libraries of the Ohio State University, plus some additional information obtained from the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C.

Some of the terms to be used in this paper will be defined in the following section.

TERMINOLOGY

Merit Rating	- an orderly, systematic method of evaluating the present and potential usefulness of individuals to their organization. ¹
--------------	---

¹ Other terms used are employee evaluation, efficiency rating or report, performance rating or record, employment development program or report, personnel record, progress report, etc.

Personnel Handbook. Edited by John F. Mee. New York: Ronald, 1951. p. 281.

Continued in the Navy and industry, with that possibility
applicable to naval officers being considered for that year
and so industrial interests being considered for the same
regiment will be considered in any detail. Naval rating has
some other advantages than the industrial one, being that
some of them, in many ways, will be more of them. Some of
which will be listed in the appendix in the list of
the other two, and so on. The other two, being that
obtained from the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington,

There is no further action.

One of the items to be done is to get the

[illegible]

1. Green Paper and its related legislation, efficient
 taking of reports, development taking in report, important
 development projects of report, personal record, progress
 report, etc.
 International Relations, edited by John W. Hall, New York:
 McGraw-Hill, 1961. 2. Vol.

Officer's
Fitness Report

- may also be referred to as "Report on the Fitness of Officers." It is the Navy's equivalent of merit rating for officers.

Top Management

- executives concerned primarily with the determination of objectives, policy formulation, and the coordination and control of a particular division of the company, or higher responsibility.¹

Flag Rank

- the Navy's top management executives. The term describes the ranks of Rear Admiral, Vice

¹ Holden, Fish, and Smith break down top management into three zones consisting of (1) the trusteeship function, (2) the general management or administrative function, and (3) the divisional or departmental function.

Paul E. Holden, Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith. Top Management Organization and Control. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1949. pp. 15-16.

- can also be referred to as

"report on the fitness of of-

there." It is the way's

equivalent of nearly failing for

others.

- executives concerned primarily

with the determination of ob-

jectives, policy formulation,

and the determination and con-

trol of a particular division

of the company, or higher re-

sponsibility.

- the way's top management ex-

ecutive. The term executive

the ranks of high school, vice

Flag Bank

1
Nelson, 1914, and which break down top management
into three main categories of (1) the executive function,
(2) the general management or administrative function, and
(3) the divisional or departmental function.
Paul H. Nelson, *Executive Function and Control*, 1914, and Robert L. Nelson,
The Management Function and Control, 1914, 1915, 1916.

Admiral, and Admiral.¹

Industry

- all establishments of the United States which are sufficiently complex that they require top management executives to plan, organize, and control their business activities. The term would not be as definitive in normal usage, but in this paper it is intended to exclude those business organizations in which a top executive's job is a mixture of operative as well as administrative management.

Establishment

- any business organization capable of continued independent operation.²

¹ The term "Flag" Officers is used to denote those for whom a flag is flown to indicate their presence aboard a ship or station. In wartime there are the additional ranks of Commodore and Fleet Admiral.

² Ralph C. Davis. The Fundamentals of Top Management. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. p. 523.

Admitted, was admitted.

All examinations of the

United States with the will-

ingly simple that they re-

ceive top management executives

to plan, organize, and control

their business activities. The

view would not be as definitive

in normal usage, but in this

paper it is intended to include

those business organizations in

which a top executive's job is

a mixture of operative as well

as administrative management.

Any business organization exp-

ects of continued technological

evolution.

Industry

Administration

1 The term "top" officer is used to denote those
two whose line is that of ultimate responsibility
in ship or station. In various cases the additional
words of command and fleet chief.

2 Major C. Smith, The Administration of the Navy,
New York, McGraw-Hill, 1911, p. 173.

Selection
(in industry)

- generally connotes choosing for employment and/or training. Promotions are made from these trainees.

Selection
(in the Navy)

- because "Selection Boards" are formed, usually once each year, to select officers from each rank for promotion to the next higher rank, the term generally means choosing for promotion in naval parlance.¹

THE PROBLEM

The selection of the best Armed Forces officers and the best industrial executives for promotion to top level responsibilities is of vital importance to everyone who has the best interests of the United States and its defense as a primary concern. This importance may not be immediately

¹ Once an officer has been selected and his selection approved by the President with Senate concurrence, promotion follows as soon as a vacancy occurs (provided that the required physical and mental examinations are satisfactorily completed). The difference, then, between "selection in industry and in the Navy is as follows: In industry, the emphasis is to select for employment and/or training; in the Navy, the emphasis is on promotion and further training.

[illegible]

The collection of 100 West Coast Forest alligators and the best illustrated specimens for preservation in two levels were specialized in oil of olive immersion to preserve the wax. The best collection of the West Coast and the alligator as a primary concern. This department may not be immediately

1. Over an office has been refused and its collection approved by the President and Senate Committee, House-
also before as well as a young woman (provided that the
referred physical and mental examinations were satisfactorily
completed). The Committee, then, before "collection is in-
vested and in the way is in the way. In Norway, the ex-
istence is an action for employment under contract in the
way, and especially in an emergency and further training.

evident to the average person. As long as things seem to be progressing satisfactorily, there are, quite understandably, many things which are of more immediate concern to him. When an emergency occurs which requires action of some kind from the top level executives, the general public has the right to expect that action will be forthcoming and that it will be timely and correct.

The problem, then, is to insure that this trust is never betrayed, within the means available.

THE SOLUTION

These matters are constantly under study by the Armed Forces and by individual companies. The problem has long had the attention of leaders in industrial¹ and naval affairs. However, it is felt that there is still room for much improvement. No matter how far-sighted planners may be, no plan is so good that it cannot be improved. That is the attitude which prompts this study.

The solution to the problem of maintaining the best executives in order to provide a continual flow into positions of top responsibility requires that the selection for promotion differentiate among the able executives available

¹ Fayol discusses this subject in his works (based on a lecture given in 1908).

Henri Fayol. General and Industrial Management. Translated by Constance Storrs. New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1949. pp. 78-79.

evidence to the contrary. As long as things seem to

be progressing satisfactorily, there are, quite naturally,

ably, many things which are of more immediate concern to

him. When an emergency occurs which requires action of

some kind from the top level executives, the general public

has the right to expect that action will be forthcoming and

that it will be timely and correct.

The problem, then, is to insure that this trend is

never betrayed within the means available.

THE SOLUTION

These matters are constantly under study by the staff

forces and by individual companies. The problem has long

and the reputation of business is constantly being raised

higher. However, it is felt that there is still room for

much improvement. No matter how far-advanced planning may

be, no plan is so good that it cannot be improved. That is

the attitude which prompts this study.

The solution to the problem of maintaining the best

executives in order to provide a continual flow into posi-

tions of top responsibility requires that the selection for

promotion alternatives among the able executives available

I have discussed this subject in my earlier (based on a

lecture given in 1957).

Henry Fayol, General and Industrial Management, Trans-

lated by Constance Storrs, New York: Pitman Publishing

Company, 1949, pp. 78-79.

for top management and siphon off the cream of the crop. This may be possible by the use of merit rating. The purpose of this study is to investigate the part that merit rating does have, and the part that it should have in the selection for promotion of the best top level executives in the Navy.

METHODOLOGY

Within the limits of sources of material stated previously, this study will be taken up in the following manner.

In Chapter II, the background of merit rating will be examined briefly. The general subjects of how, why, what, and when to use merit rating will be discussed.

Chapter III will contain a description of the types of merit rating with the inherent advantages and disadvantages of each type.

In the next chapter, sources of error will be investigated, validity will be discussed, and some principles of merit rating will be derived and stated.

The use of merit rating in the Navy and in industry will then be covered in Chapters V and VI. This will include such things as its correlation with other factors considered when selecting a promotee, and comments on the ef-

The top management and almost all the members of the staff.

This may be possible by the use of some visiting. The two-

books of this study is to investigate the new that work

having been done, and the fact that it should have in the

reference for provision of the best top level executives.

in the Navy.

Introduction

Within the limits of knowledge of material stated pre-

sented, this study will be taken up in the following man-

ner.

In Chapter II, the background of naval testing will be

examined briefly. The general objective of the study will

be stated in the next chapter. The study will be presented.

Chapter III will contain a description of the types of

tests being used in the present experiments and the advantages

of each type.

In the next chapter, sources of error will be discussed.

Chapter V will be devoted to the discussion of the results of

the study and the conclusions.

The use of naval testing in the Navy and in industry

will then be covered in Chapter VI. This will be

followed by a chapter on the future of naval testing.

Chapter VIII will contain a summary of the study.

fectiveness of merit rating as a factor.

Chapter VII will be devoted to a comparison of naval and industrial training and promotion problems.

In the final chapter, some conclusions will be drawn and recommendations will be made concerning the use of merit rating, the rating form, and the merit rater.

...the ... of ...
...will be ... as a ... of ...
...and ... and ...
...In the ... some ... with the ...
...will be ... the ... of ...
...the ... and the ...

CHAPTER II

MERIT RATING

HISTORY

Benge¹ says, "One of the earliest antecedents of merit rating as we know the term today lay in the formal recording of interviewer's impressions." The first use of merit rating as such is credited to Robert Owen, the Scottish mill owner who, in the early nineteenth century, kept "character books" for his employees and displayed a colored block indicative of merit on each worker's bench.² The U. S. Army deserves the credit for introduction of and most of the advances made in new methods in the United States to date. The Army used merit rating in the War of 1812,³ introduced man-to-man rating during World War I, and introduced

¹ Eugene J. Benge. Job Evaluation and Merit Rating. Deep River, Conn.: National Foreman's Institute, 1941. p. 48.

² Lawrence L. Bethel, Franklin S. Atwater, George H. E. Smith, and Harvey A. Stackman, Jr. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950. p. 651.

³ The first recorded efficiency report in the Archives of the War Department has been reproduced in Appendix A.

RENTAL RATES

HISTORY

Recent years have seen the earliest antecedents of rental rates as we know the first today in the formal proceedings of industry's investigations. The first use of rental rates as such is credited to Robert Owen, the Scottish mill owner who, in the early nineteenth century, kept "charge books" for his employees and displayed a colored disk indicative of each on each worker's breast.¹ The U. S. Army describes the credit for investigation of and most of the data made in any number in the United States to date. The Army and Navy acting in the year of 1912,² introduced man-to-man rating during World War I, and introduced

¹ Thomas A. Morgan, Job Evaluation and Rental Rates, Deep River, Conn.: National Personnel Institute, 1941, p. 48.

² Lawrence J. Bell, Franklin D. Roosevelt, George H. E. Smith, and Harvey A. Friedman, Jr., Industrial Organization and Management, New York: Holt-Rinehart & Co., 1941.

³ The first recorded efficiency report in the history of the War Department has been reproduced in Appendix A.

forced-choice rating during World War II.¹ The U. S. Civil Service first used merit rating in Chicago in 1910.² The indication seems clear that various government agencies were well acquainted with merit rating before industry became interested. John W. Dalzell³ indicates, in discussing supervisor rating during the middle 1920's, that all companies with merit rating programs probably started after World War I and copied the Army system. However, by 1926 most companies had gotten away from the Army system and had developed one of their own.⁴

The following questions naturally arise: What is merit rating? Why use it? What does it do? When should it be

¹ Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel give credit to the Bureau of Salesmanship Research for interesting the U. S. Army in merit rating. As a result, the Army adopted it as the official system for promotion.

Walter Dill Scott, Robert C. Clothier, and William R. Spriegel. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. pp. 188-189. See also

Bernard J. Muller-Thym and Melvin E. Salveson. "Developing Executives for Business Leadership," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 25, No. 4, January 1949. pp. 250-260.

² Bethel et al., op. cit., p. 635.

³ Harvey G. Ellerd. "Rating Supervisors," Production Executive Series No. 42, AMA, 1926. p. 11.

⁴ The Dennison Manufacturing Company was the first industrial company to experiment with and adopt a systematic method of rating. It was based on the Army system.

Ordway Tead and Henry C. Metcalf. Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1920. p. 59.

1950-1951 during which time the U. S. Civil
 Service first used word processing in Chicago in 1950. The in-
 dication seems to be that certain government agencies were
 well acquainted with word processing before industry became in-
 volved. John W. Murray, President, in discussing word-
 processing during the mid-1950's, was all acquainted with
 word processing systems probably started after World War I
 and called the Army system. However, by 1950 word processing
 had gotten away from the Army system and had developed one
 of their own.

The following questions naturally arise: What is word
 processing? Why was it? What does it do? When should it be

1. Word, Dictation, and Dictaphone give credit to the
 Bureau of Communications Research for introducing the U. S.
 Army in 1918. As a result, the Army adopted it as
 the official system for processing.
 Major C. L. Cook, Major C. L. Bishop, and William A.
 (Special Agent in Charge), New York, New York, 1918-1919.
 Between 1918-1919 and 1919-1920, the Army
 was interested in word processing. (Special Agent in
 Charge, New York, New York, 1918-1919, pp. 1-100)

2. Word at Work, pp. 1-100, 1918-1919.

3. Word at Work, pp. 1-100, 1918-1919.

4. The American word processing company was the first
 industrial company to experiment with word processing. It was
 also the first to develop a word processing system.
 The word processing system was developed by the American
 word processing company, New York, New York, 1918-1919, pp. 1-100.

used? The answers to these questions will be undertaken here, and further expounded upon in Chapter III.

GENERAL

What is merit rating? It is a method of comparing individuals with each other, or against a job, by gathering opinions about them. From this description, one might think that merit rating is something like a popularity poll. Although this is not exactly the case, merit rating might be considered a device for measuring the subordinate's popularity in the eyes of his seniors, but based primarily on ability to accomplish a job rather than ability as a charmer.

It is a formal system whereby a superior, by comparing various characteristics of an individual with the same characteristics of all other persons under his immediate supervision, determines the relative worth of each of those persons to the organization; or, the superior may rate an individual's ability to do his assigned tasks and then compare all those persons who have the same, or similar, jobs in order to determine the relative worth of each subordinate.

How does one decide what characteristics or traits to

about the number of these persons will be indicated

here, and further explained upon in Chapter III.

GENERAL

What is meant by this? It is a matter of comparing in-

stances with each other, or against a job, by following

actions about them. From this position, one might

think that one is making a comparison like a hypothesis, but

although this is not usually the case, one is not making

an assumption or a device for making the hypothesis's pop-

ularity in the eyes of his audience, but is not primarily an

ability to recognize a few names with ability as a science,

It is a formal system whereby a hypothesis, by comparing

various characteristics of an individual with the same char-

acteristics of all other persons under the immediate super-

vision, determines the relative worth of each of these per-

sons in the organization and the superior may rate an in-

dividual's ability to do his assigned work and then compare

All these persons and have the same, an inferior, take in

order to determine the relative worth of each individual.

How does one define what constitutes an inferior as

use?¹ The traits chosen must be those which are specifically related to the job performance of the individual being rated, or related to the job for which he is under consideration as a promotee. Furthermore, the characteristics must be limited to those which a rater can observe. This can be accomplished by a clear description of the various degrees of each trait.² Use of such descriptions enables the rater to interpret the degree of each characteristic in terms of how the individual acts. It has the additional advantage that every rater is more likely to have the same concept of what type of action fits what degree of a trait. It is safe to say that the more objectively the rater can view each characteristic, the more reliable the rating.

¹ Davis throws some light on the complexity of this problem by citing a survey of opinions he once made. He asked a number of competent students of business what characteristics they would list as essential for executives. His final list had fifty-six essential characteristics.

Ralph C. Davis. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940, p. 32.

² For example, the term "Exercise Judgment" is listed as a trait on a Navy Fitness Report. This is an extremely difficult trait to mark if no amplifying description is given. On another form this trait was broken down into degrees and described as follows: "Exceptional in ability to think, plan, and do things without waiting to be told and instructed," "Able to plan and execute missions on his own responsibility," "Capable of performing routine duties on own responsibility," "Requires constant guidance and supervision in his work, or evades responsibility."

[illegible]

1
Trevi presents some light on the possibility of this
provision by citing a survey of conditions in some states, in
which a number of important elements of business were
abolished which would have been essential for economic
stimulus. The firm also has the essential elements
of a new, industrial revolution and change.
New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940, p. 15.

2 For example, the term "Executive Judgment" is listed as a factor on a Navy Selection Board. This is an extremely difficult word to use if no qualifying description is given. On January 1941 this word was written down into letters and arranged as follows: "Executive Judgment is ability to think, plan, and do things without waiting to be told and to stand up to others and change situation on his own responsibility." Changes in punctuation resulted in the following: "Executive Judgment is ability to think, plan, and do things without waiting to be told and to stand up to others and change situation on his own responsibility." Changes in this word, or words responsibility.

Overlapping traits make it difficult for the rater to distinguish where one trait ends and another begins. If overlapping between traits is fairly general, it is almost impossible for the rater to avoid "halo effects."¹

To summarize: (1) Traits selected must have significance relative to the job being performed, (2) raters should uniformly attach the same definition to traits and trait degrees used, (3) traits should not overlap, and (4) traits should be observable, and observable from as objective a point of view as possible.

In all the basic types of merit rating that will be discussed, opinions on various characteristics or traits that seem to relate to the particular job are obtained and an evaluation of the results made to determine to what extent each individual meets, or fails to meet, the necessary requirements for the job in question. Under ideal conditions, only the best man in each case would get the job.

WHY USE MERIT RATING?

Listed in this section are some of the major reasons for using merit rating to supplement any plan of selection

¹ Halo effect is a rater tendency which will be discussed later in this study. The judgment on all traits tends to be effected by the impression made on the rater by one or two traits.

Five a point of view as possible.

In all the above cases it must be noted that the results are not in agreement with the theoretical predictions of the theory. It is therefore necessary to consider the possibility that the results are due to some other cause. The following are some of the possibilities which have been suggested:

For value added in production and other services

1. This letter is a letter concerning which will be discussed later in this letter. The following are all the points to be discussed in the following letter on this letter.

for promotion.

1. Merit rating helps to insure that judgment of an individual will generally reflect a sound appraisal of his performance, rather than penalizing him for isolated errors occurring just prior to his consideration for promotion.¹

2. Merit rating tends to make each promotee meet the same specifications for the same job.

3. With merit rating there is less likelihood of overlooking the capable but unspectacular worker.²

4. As a by-product of item 2, it is more nearly possible to compare promotees who are not under observation by

¹ Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance. Edited by M. Joseph Doohar and Vivienne Marquis, New York: AMA, 1950. p. 153.

Admittedly, however, an error committed just prior to possible selection for promotion will have a much higher weight in considerations than the same error committed several months previously. This is true regardless of the promotion system in effect.

² Ellerd points out that without formal merit rating, the rater is apt to consider only one or two conspicuous abilities or traits and disregard the others.

Ellerd, op. cit., p. 3.

However, as will be brought out later, a rater may arrive at the same result while using merit rating if he has a failing known as "halo effect." There is a school of thought, expressed by Webster, Winn, and Oliver, which believes that it is unnecessary and too difficult to try to get a measurement of a lot of traits. They advocate, but not in so many words, making "halo effect" work for the rater instead of against him.

E. C. Webster, A. Winn, and J. A. Oliver. "Case Study of Merit Rating Forms: Simplification and Reduction of Traits for Raters," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 5, March 1951. p. 415 ff.

1. The first factor which is known that influences at an individual will generally reflect a more general at his characteristics, rather than particular his for detailed events occurring that time in his consideration for purposes.
2. The second factor which is also well known that the same consideration for the same job.
3. The third factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
4. The fourth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
5. The fifth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.

6. The sixth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
7. The seventh factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
8. The eighth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
9. The ninth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
10. The tenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
11. The eleventh factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
12. The twelfth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
13. The thirteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
14. The fourteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
15. The fifteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
16. The sixteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
17. The seventeenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
18. The eighteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
19. The nineteenth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.
20. The twentieth factor which is also known that the same consideration for the same job.

the same superiors, or who are physically separated at all times.¹

WHAT DOES MERIT RATING DO?

The user of merit rating must understand the following distinctions, otherwise he will be disappointed with the results attained.²

1. Merit rating obtains opinions about people in a situation.

2. It does not measure performance or personality traits directly.

As a result of evaluating the opinions obtained, it is possible to reach a conclusion as to the performance of the individual, provided that the traits considered are applicable to the job being performed.³ In addition, it is possible to

¹ Webster et al., make the point that when an individual moves from one place to another, it becomes easier to judge him from a distance if a series of factual observations have been obtained.

loc. cit.

This situation is particularly applicable to naval officers.

² Personnel Handbook. Edited by John F. Mee. New York: Ronald, 1951. p. 281.

³ Bengé points out that the general use of merit rating is to obtain an analysis of the performance of an individual in his present job.

Bengé, op. cit., p. 55, item 8.

the same hypothesis, in the way actually suggested by all
times.¹

WHAT DOES MEANING MEAN?

The view of words being used in the following
distinctions, however, will be distinguished with the

results of the following.

1. Words being used in the following
situation.

2. It does not mean the same as the following.

3. It does not mean the same as the following.

4. It does not mean the same as the following.

5. It does not mean the same as the following.

6. It does not mean the same as the following.

7. It does not mean the same as the following.

8. It does not mean the same as the following.

9. It does not mean the same as the following.

10. It does not mean the same as the following.

11. It does not mean the same as the following.

12. It does not mean the same as the following.

13. It does not mean the same as the following.

14. It does not mean the same as the following.

15. It does not mean the same as the following.

16. It does not mean the same as the following.

17. It does not mean the same as the following.

evaluate potential usefulness, provided these aspects are clearly differentiated.¹ It must be remembered that the traits applicable to the new job must be used if the objective is to judge performance ability in a new job.

WHEN USE MERIT RATING?

Use merit rating only if it is designed to serve specific objectives. The specific objective considered in this study is to determine if merit rating can be used to aid in selecting for promotion the best executives to assume top management responsibility. To accomplish this purpose, the evaluation of the promotee must be taken from traits or characteristics which are necessary for the new top management job. Technical competence on the present job gives no basis for assuming that the executive is automatically prepared for the job with higher responsibility, unless the present and future jobs are similar, or overlap. Furthermore, administrative adequacy at one level does not insure the adequacy in administration required at higher levels.

Other than for promotion, merit rating has various possibilities which will be stated briefly:

¹

Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 281.

various technical methods, provided these methods are
directly demonstrated. It must be remembered that the
method applied to the new job must be used if the object
ive is to judge performance ability in a new job.

THE NEW METHOD

The new method says it is designed to assess ap-
proach objectives. The objective relative conditions in this
study is no different if some testing can be used to aid in
selecting for promotion the best candidate for a new job.
management responsibility. To accomplish this purpose, the
evaluation of the procedure must be given first priority in
characteristics which are necessary for the new method.
new job. Technical competence on the present job does not
guarantee the learning that the candidate is responsible for
based on the job with highest responsibility, unless the
present and future jobs are similar, or overlap. Further-
more, administrative responsibility at one level does not insure
the adequacy of administrative methods at higher levels.
Other than for promotion, some testing has various
possibilities which will be stated briefly:

1. Technical competence, p. 131, v. 131.

1. Development of the individual rated by identifying his shortcomings for him.¹
2. Determination of training program results, or needed changes thereto.²
3. Providing the basis for personnel actions such as demotion, layoff, wage and salary adjustment, etc.³
4. To serve as a criterion of performance for obtaining persons to test personnel tests.⁴
5. Providing a permanent uniform record of an individual's past progress, present status, and future potentialities.⁵

¹ The opportunity is given "To see ourselves as others see us," as Robert Burns expressed it. However, the manner in which the information is given and/or received will determine whether improvement actually takes place.

Wayne G. Samples. A Study of Rating Methods for Professional Employees. Unpublished M. A. Thesis. The Ohio State University, 1948, p. 16.

Michael J. Jucius. Personnel Management. Chicago: Irwin, 1951, p. 245.

Joseph Tiffin. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948, pp. 329-330.

² Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 282.
Tiffin, op. cit., pp. 332-333.

³ Tiffin, op. cit., p. 331-332.

⁴ Tiffin, op. cit., p. 322.

⁵ Mary Harper Wortham. "Rating of Supervisors," Industrial Relations Section, California Institute of Technology. Bulletin No. 11, p. 6.

1. Development of the individual phases of identifying the characteristics of the individual.
2. Investigation of learning factors, habits, or related changes.
3. Providing the basis for personnel actions such as promotion, salary, and safety adjustment, etc.
4. To serve as a criterion of performance for obtaining persons in this personnel field.
5. Providing a systematic method of no further study's test program, present status, and future potential.

The opportunity is given to the examinee to answer as many as he can of the questions in the test. The manner in which the examinee is given and/or received will determine whether improvement actually takes place.

Major D. Campbell, a study of testing methods for the Industrial Engineer, Unpublished M. A. Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1940, p. 10.

Michael J. Taylor, Personnel Measurement, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1937, p. 202.

Joseph E. Riney, Industrial Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1940, pp. 202-210.

6. Personnel Handbook, pp. 211-212, 213.
7. Testing of the Individual, p. 211-212.
8. Testing of the Individual, p. 211.
9. Personnel Handbook, "Testing of the Individual," Industrial Engineering Division, California Institute of Technology, Bulletin No. 11, p. 1.

6. Standardizing the basis of supervisory judgments by providing an organized pattern for forming opinions.¹

7. Providing a basis for judging the rater.²

¹ Wortham, op. cit., p. 6.

² ibid.

6. Representative the basis of supervisory judgment

by providing an explicit pattern for forming opinions.²

7. Provides a basis for judging the cases.³

1. Forming, of, the, opinion, of, the, case.

2. Forming, of, the, opinion, of, the, case.

CHAPTER III

TYPES OF MERIT RATING

There are three basic types of merit rating, each having certain inherent advantages and disadvantages.¹ These basic types are:

1. Rating Scales
2. Comparison Systems
3. Check Lists

In choosing a merit rating system, one finds no easy formula to guarantee success for a particular type, or combination of types, of merit rating. In other words, there is no package deal which can be selected because it seems successful to another activity or in another situation. Rather, it requires the basic type, or combination of types, which will best serve the specific objectives desired, coupled with:²

1. Competent direction

¹ Personnel Handbook. Edited by John F. Mee. New York: Ronald, 1951. p. 289.

Lawrence L. Bethel, Franklin S. Atwater, George H. E. Smith, and Harvey A. Stackman, Jr. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950. p. 653 ff.

² Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 288.

THEORY OF BASIC TYPES

There are three basic types of mental testing, each having its own special characteristics and limitations.¹ These basic types are:

1. Intelligence Testing
2. Personality Testing
3. Group Testing

In discussing a mental testing system, one finds no easy formula to determine whether for a particular type, or combination of types, of mental testing. In other words, there is no primary goal which can be selected because it seems essential to another activity or to another situation. Rather, it depends on the basic type, or combination of types, which will best serve the specific objectives desired, coupled with²

I. Intelligence Testing

¹ Personality Testing, edited by John E. Brier, New York: Grune, 1921, p. 235.
Intelligence Testing, edited by John E. Brier, New York: Grune, 1921, p. 235.
Group Testing, edited by John E. Brier, New York: Grune, 1921, p. 235.

² Personality Testing, pp. 235, 236.

2. Genuine interest in making the program a success.
3. Time and effort by those involved in the program's development and implementation.
4. Acceptance of the program by the entire organization.

RATING SCALES¹

Rating scales consist of lists of traits or characteristics. The rater is expected to indicate his judgment of the degree to which an individual has, or exercises, that trait. The various degrees may be described or not. However, it is a great advantage if each trait degree is described so that it will mean more nearly the same to each rater. In some rating scales, a point value is assigned to each trait degree. A manipulation of these point values gives a final score which can be compared with the scores of others to obtain a comparison, or rank-order, in accordance with relative ability.

Traits are selected only if their presence or absence would effect the ability of the individual to perform the job(s) under consideration. If there is doubt as to which traits are more important, this data can be computed by statisticians. They can also determine relative weights

¹ Personnel Handbook, op. cit., pp. 289, 294, 301, 306.

3. Genuine interest in making the program a success.
2. Time and effort of those involved in the program's development and implementation.
4. Achievement of the program by the entire organization.

RELATIVE SCALING

Relative scaling consists of lists of traits or characteristics. The trait is expressed in individual his judgment of the degree to which an individual has, or exercises, that trait. The various degrees may be described as not, less, more, or a great deal more. If each trait degree is described as not, less, more, or a great deal more, then each trait degree is assigned a point value. In some relative scaling, a point value is assigned to each trait degree. A distinction of some point values gives a final score which can be compared with the scores of others to obtain a comparison, or rank-order, in each case with relative scaling.

These are selected only if their presence or absence would affect the quality of the individual or person who (s) is being compared. It must be noted that the traits are not important, but they can be compared by themselves. They are also relative scaling.

to be applied to each trait so that it will ¹effect the final score in proportion to its importance. However, any system of arriving at a single average score in order to determine the relative merit of each executive has a serious drawback. In the extreme case, such a system of weighting and averaging would permit the absence of a trait to be disregarded if all other traits were high enough. At the executive level under consideration, i.e., - ready for top management responsibility, it appears that lack of any qualification which would effect performance of the job to be done is sufficient reason to not promote, notwithstanding an abundance of all other necessary traits.¹

The rating scale has certain definite advantages. It may be more acceptable because more people are familiar with it. The completed report form for an individual contains the kind of information that permits frank counseling of that person.² If a small number are to be rated, the rating

¹ In substantiation of this opinion, Evans states, "Beware of a point rating system -- fifty good apples and fifty bad apples do not make a hundred medium apples."

J. J. Evans, Jr. A Program for Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945. p. 41.

² To be most useful in this respect, the rating form should include the rater's comments on specific aspects of the ratee's performance or behavior, in order to substantiate and justify the trait degrees checked.

to be applied to each item as soon as it will be possible to make
 some in preparation for the comparison. However, any system
 of arriving at a single average score is open to criticism
 the relative weight of each evidence has a serious drawback.
 In the extreme case, when a system of weighting and averaging
 has been used, the result of a single item to be disregarded it
 all other items were high enough. In the negative level
 when consideration is given to the top management people
 ability to represent each item of the distribution which
 would reflect performance of the job as he does in reality
 reason do not provide, notwithstanding an abundance of all
 other necessary factors.¹
 The rating scale has certain decided advantages. It
 may be said that the present system of rating the quality of
 10. The completed report form for an individual candidate
 the kind of information that details items consisting of
 that person.² If a small number are to be rated, the rating

¹ In preparation of this opinion, I have noted
 "Review of a point rating system" - fifty good scales and
 fifty bad scales do not make a hundred scales applied."
 J. L. Gwyn, Jr. A Program for Personnel Scales.
 Garden, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1932, p. 61.

² To be most useful in this respect, the rating form
 should include the reviewer's comments on specific aspects of
 the review's performance or behavior, in order to encourage
 and justify the staff's behavior.

scale type of merit rating will probably best serve the purpose.

There are two sub-types under this basic type:

1. Graphic Rating Scales.
2. Multiple-Step Rating Scales.

The graphic rating scale lists and also describes each trait so that each rater will better understand it. The degrees of each trait usually are also described in such a manner that it is clear which of the degrees is highest and lowest, as well as the relative desirability of each of the other degrees between the two extremes. The number of degrees per trait varies from three on some forms to seven on others. Five degrees of each trait are frequently used. Each trait is represented by a horizontal line. The usual method is for the highest degree of each trait to be represented by the same end of all the lines. The least degree of any trait is then represented by the opposite end of each line with three equally spaced marks between the extremes representing the intermediate degrees of the trait. (For forms using seven degrees, there would be five intermediate divisions.) It is possible to obtain a good idea of the merit of the individual (in the rater's judgment) by

glancing at the check marks of all traits at once.¹

Whereas, in the graphic scale it is possible to indicate that the ratee possesses a degree of a trait somewhere between two described degrees, in the multiple-step rating scale the rater must confine himself to one specific degree. However, this procedure is sometimes varied to permit marking high, low or medium amounts of a degree. The two subtypes of rating scales are markedly similar.

COMPARISON SYSTEMS²

Comparison systems are based on relative performance between individuals rather than against a standard. Another common name for this type of merit rating is the "man-to-man" system. "Man-job" rating connotes rating against a standard where average performance of the job is the

¹ Although it is an advantage in evaluation to be able to obtain an overall impression of the rater's judgment of an individual, it is also a potential disadvantage in that raters may tend to rate all traits so that they will fall nearly in a vertical line at about the general degree of the average ability the rater considers the ratee to have. This type of error will be discussed further in a later section.

² The Personnel Handbook, op. cit., pp. 294-297, 307-308.

... of water and the resulting solution ...
... the high, low or neutral amount of a degree. The two ...
... However, this procedure is sometimes used to provide ...
... again the water must contain sufficient in one specific degree ...
... between the indicated degree, in the highly-soluble ...
... the high, low or neutral amount of a degree of a ...
... However, in the specific case it is possible to ...
... depending on the above range of all results as shown.

Comparison systems are based on relative performance between individuals rather than on absolute, standard scores. This type of unit testing is the "best" way to test, and it is the only way to test a group of individuals.

Although it is an advantage in evaluation to be able to obtain an overall impression of the entire judgment of an individual, it is also a potential disadvantage in that persons may tend to rate all parties as they will tell us they are in a verbal line as about the general nature of the persons telling the story because they want to have this line of action will be discussed further in a later section.

5
The University of Maryland
College Park, Md. 20742

standard.¹ In using man-to-man rating the relative over-all performance is usually considered, rather than performance on each of several traits. However, either or both methods may be used.

This type of rating is easier than comparing an actual against a theoretical standard.² In this respect lies the greatest advantage of the comparison systems over rating scales. The same features that make this method easier, also make it more accurate. Thus, it has somewhat greater consistency than rating scales. Similarly, rater train-

¹ On the subject of when to use man-to-man and man-job rating, some advocate the use of man-job ratings in considering an individual for promotion. They say do not match possible promotees directly against one another. The "qualitative matching or deficiency of traits is the important thing."

Eugene J. Benge. Job Evaluation and Merit Rating. Deep River, Conn.: National Foremen's Institute, 1941, p. 62.

Samples concluded that man-to-job rating is necessary to help a man improve himself because man-to-man comparison must of necessity depend on two variables -- each man's day-to-day job performance.

Wayne G. Samples. A Study of Rating Methods for Professional Employees. Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Ohio State University, 1948. pp. 30-31.

² For example, it is easier to tell which of two objects is larger, nearer, higher, etc. (when viewed at the same time) than it is to estimate the distance or dimensions in measurement terms for each object and then, by comparison of these estimated measurements, arrive at a comparison between the two objects.

standard. In using man-to-man rating the relative over-all performance is usually considered, rather than performance on each of several traits. However, either or both methods may be used.

This type of rating is easier than comparing an actual against a theoretical standard. In this respect it is less frequent subject of the experimental systems over rating series. The main reason that rates this method easier, is no more of more complex. Thus, it has somewhat greater consistency than rating series. Statistically, rating series

On the subject of when to use man-to-man and man-to-job rating, some authors give the man-to-job rating is considered an individual for promotion. They say do not make positive statements directly against the "qualitative ranking or deficiency of traits is the important thing."

Figure 2, Sample. Joe Evaluation and Marie Rating. Deep River, Conn.: National Personnel Institute, 1941, p. 62. Samples included that man-to-job rating is more easy to both a man improve himself because man-to-man comparison must of necessity depend on two variables -- each man's day-to-day performance.

Figure 3, Sample. A Study of Rating Methods for Personnel Management. Undated W. A. Smith. Ohio State University, 1945, pp. 30-31.

For example, it is easier to tell which of two jobs is larger, heavier, higher, etc. (than stated in the same line) than it is to estimate the difference in quality. In measurement terms for each object and then by comparison of these relative measurements, arrive at a comparison between the two objects.

ing does not need to be as intensive as with the rating scale method.

Disadvantages of this system are that it stacks individuals only against others on the same job at nearly the same time, and it does not provide necessary information for counseling. This second fault can be corrected by requiring rater comments.

The comparison method is most useful when there are a number of persons on the same job to be rated. It is not satisfactory for one or a small number of ratees.

The sub-types of the comparison systems are:

1. Paired Comparison.
2. Rank-Order.
3. Forced Distribution.

Paired comparison requires that every person doing a particular job be paired with every other individual who does that same job. The rater judges which man of each pair is better. On the basis of the number of times one man is favored over another, it is possible to derive a

ing does not need to be as elaborate as with the vintage-

basic method.

Disadvantages of this system are that it is not fully-

flexible and requires a lot of work on the part of the

user, and it does not provide necessary information

for computing. This means that it can be supported by the

existing data base.

The computer method is more exact than the other

method of persons on the part of the user. It is not

necessary for one to have a small number of persons.

The advantages of the computer system are:

1. Large computer.

2. Wide range.

3. Large data base.

4. Large computer.

5. Large data base.

6. Large computer.

7. Large data base.

8. Large computer.

9. Large data base.

rank-order of those on that particular job.¹ This is the simplest and easiest merit rating system, but the total time required will usually be greater than with the rank-order or forced distribution systems. This is especially true with a large number of persons to judge. It is particularly suited for high accuracy in differentiating performance of individuals and for validating tests.

The rank-order system is most simply accomplished by placing each man's name on a card and arranging the cards in order of ability. This may not be possible with a large number of ratees. The method requires little training, but has the disadvantage of lack of data with which to counsel.² The rank-order comparison system is well-suited for obtain-

¹ The U. S. Army tried a form of paired comparison during World War I. The method, credited to Dr. Walter Dill Scott, was for the rater to place at each trait degree, the name of the officer who, in the rater's opinion, embodied that trait degree. The officer being marked was then compared directly with other officers who represented every trait degree. The tremendous undertaking involved in correlating the comparisons so that every officer could be placed in rank-order according to his value to the Army, can be envisioned.

Ordway Tead and Henry C. Metcalf. Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1920. pp. 58-59.

² With the rank-order method it will probably be impossible to satisfactorily explain to the man ranked number ten, why he was not ranked number nine, etc.

transmission of data on any particular day. This is the
 simplest and easiest way of doing it, but the total time
 required will usually be greater than with the other methods.
 In the case of a transmission system, this is especially true
 with a large number of persons to be reached. It is particularly
 useful for high speed transmission of information to
 individuals and for visiting lists.

The transmission system is also easily accomplished by
 placing each man's name on a card and arranging the cards
 in order of priority. This may not be possible with a large
 number of names. The method requires little training, but
 has the disadvantage of loss of data when used to transmit.
 The transmission system is well suited for obtaining

The U. S. Army used a form of signal transmission
 during World War I. The method, described in U. S. Signal Bulletin
 No. 1, was not used to place a man's name on a card, but
 was of the type in which the man's name was written on a
 card and placed in a box. The man's name was then com-
 pared directly with other names who were placed in boxes
 of the same type. The transmission method is similar to the
 one described in that every officer could be placed
 in each group according to his name as he was, and he
 was then.

General James and Henry C. Henshaw, Signal Bulletin
 No. 1, 1920, pp. 25-26.

With the transmission method it is possible to in-
 crease the number of names to be reached, and, why he was not reached, name, etc.

ing a spread of men by their ability for any purpose. It is also suitable for test validation.

The forced distribution system¹ is based on the assumption that persons on a given job form a normal distribution.² The question to be decided is whether it is better to force ratings into a normal distribution, or to put up with the bunching at the top of the scale that is typical of rating scale methods.

When conscientiously used, this method has the advantage of spreading the promotees out over the entire rating scale. For example, one percentage split frequently made is ten, twenty, forty, twenty, ten. It may be, and usually is, difficult for the rater to decide where the fine line

¹ Where there are few men to be rated the forced distribution system becomes a refinement of the rank-order method, because the simplest way is to arrange the men in rank-order first. On the other hand, the forced distribution feature may be attached to rating scale or check list methods, in which case there would be no ranking within groups. Due to its all-around applicability, forced distribution could almost be considered as a separate category of merit rating instead of a comparison system sub-type.

² It would be a rarity, of course, if the persons on a job had traits in such degree that a plot of the abilities of the group exactly formed a normal distribution. However, the chances are that the abilities of any group will approximate this type distribution.

Joseph Tiffin. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948. p. 490.

ing a spread of two or three units for any purpose. It

is also possible for the validation

The forward distribution system¹ is based on the assumption

that the person on a given job has a normal distribution²

The question as to whether it is better to have

being into a normal distribution, or to put up with the

resulting in the fact of the scale that is typical of rating

scale methods.

When normality is used, this means for the observer

that of spreading the process out over the entire rating

scale. For example, one person's rating might be

10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, and usually

is, distribute the rating to include about the time line

1. There are two ways to be rated the forward dis-

tribution system because a rating of the same order

method, because the rating is to average the two in

each order. In the first case, the rating is

the rating may be spread to rating scale of each line

method, in which case there would be no rating scale

groups. The two all-around ratings, forward dis-

tribution would be considered as a separate category

of rating being based on a comparison system and type.

2. It would be a matter of degree, if the person on

a job had to be in some degree that a job of the same

of the group rating forward a normal distribution. However,

the observer has the addition of the rating will be

perhaps this type distribution.

James W. H. International Psychology. New York:

Frontier-Hill, 1960. P. 190.

between any two adjacent groups is located. However, if ten per cent are to be promoted (or thirty, or seventy per cent), the problem has been simplified for the final judge.¹ If, as is more frequently the case, the percentage to be promoted falls within a group, a further difficult decision remains.

CHECK LISTS²

Check lists are composed of statements to be checked by the rater if the description fits the individual being judged, or, in the case of forced-choice, if it least fits him. The check list methods are considered best for differentiating between persons, whether the comparison is made against performance of others directly, or against some standard. With these methods the rater actually becomes a reporter of behavior. Evaluations are generally accomplished by a higher echelon. The completed report is more objective than is probable with other merit rating types.

Check lists are of two sub-types as follows:

1. Weighted Check Lists.
2. Forced-Choice (Preferential Check Lists).

¹ The same comment applies for any other percentage split which takes advantage of existing divisions between groups.

² Personnel Handbook, op. cit., pp. 299-301, 308-309.

between any two adjacent groups is identical. However, it can
be seen that to be preserved (or added, or removed) the same
the number has been classified for the first time. It
is more frequently the case. The following is an example
moved into within a group. A further illustration is given
below.

Group 1

Group 1 is a number of elements to be chosen
by the user if the number of the individual being
tested is in the case of a fixed choice. It is fixed
for the whole first group and does not vary for either
existing between groups; however the comparison is made
against movements of a fixed kind. It is fixed and
standard. The first group and the first number become a
reference to a number. The number is a number of elements
of a fixed kind. The number is a number of elements
than is possible with other methods of testing.
Group 1 is of two types as follows:

1. Fixed Group 1.

2. Fixed Group 1 (Fixed Group 1).

The same number applies for any number of elements
which are taken advantage of during the process between
groups.

1. Fixed Group 1. 2. Fixed Group 1. 3. Fixed Group 1.

The weighted check list contains statements of behavior. The behavior must be related to the job for which the person is being rated, just as for other merit rating methods. Scale values are attached to each statement to indicate the importance of that behavior trait. A high value indicates the behavior is related to good job performance, low value to poor performance. The usual procedure is to compute an average value to indicate average performance for the individual. By comparing these average scores a rank-order of persons by ability can be obtained.

Weighted check lists should be developed specifically for particular jobs, or limited groups of associated jobs. The value of this type list tends to decrease as the range and variety of jobs to be rated with a single check list increases. With only a few individuals on a job, it may not be feasible to devote the necessary time and effort to apply this system. When use of the weighted check list is warranted, it can provide the necessary information for counseling, perhaps in an even better form than the rating scale. Its best features are its adaptability as an aid to individual development, and its greater consistency than rating scales.

The preferential check list, or forced-choice, system

The weighted mean is a statistical measure of central tendency. It is calculated by multiplying each value by its weight, summing the products, and then dividing by the sum of the weights. This method is used when some values are more important than others. For example, in a weighted average, the weights represent the relative importance of each value. The weighted mean is often used in finance, engineering, and other fields where different factors have different levels of influence.

consists of groups of statements. From each group, the rater must choose the one statement which best describes the ratee and the one statement which least describes him. Usually, there are an equal number of favorable and unfavorable statements, but only one of the favorable and one of the unfavorable statements are critical, that is, affects the rating. The statements considered critical have been found, by statistical analysis, to discriminate between successful and unsuccessful persons. Those statements which do not affect the final rating are phrases frequently used in word descriptions, but seem to have no significance in differentiating the successful from the unsuccessful. The theory is, however, that the person who has not seen the statistical analysis will not be able to tell the critical from the non-critical statements. The forced-choice method has the advantage of eliminating rater bias, both intentional and unintentional. Thus, ratings are spread along the scale in accordance with actual ability rather than being bunched together due to rater bias and/or error.

The feature which make this method so accurate relative to other methods, also makes it unpopular -- the secrecy attached to the keys. The fact that the keys must be

[illegible]

One feature which makes this method so valuable is its simplicity. It is simple to use, and it is simple to understand. It is simple to teach, and it is simple to learn. It is simple to use, and it is simple to understand. It is simple to teach, and it is simple to learn.

kept secret if all rater bias is to be eliminated, smacks of something underhanded to those who use the system. Many, if not all, raters like to think of themselves as fair and unbiased. Furthermore, there is a desire to know what kind of a rating one is fashioning for a subordinate and with this type that is impossible.¹ Likewise, it is impossible to use the completed form as an aid when counseling. This may be overcome by using a trait list in addition to the forced-choice. But, how can one be sure that the advice given will, if followed, improve the man's rating? Statisticians have proven to their own satisfaction that, if the rater marks the forced-choice statements sincerely and truthfully, a true picture of the ratee will have been painted. All that remains is to convince those who deal with the method, rater and ratee, that it is fair and it will be fully accepted. Due to the expense involved in its development, it is not suitable for a small establishment.

From the advantages listed for each type of merit rating it is now possible to summarize the plans which will probably best accomplish various specific objectives.

¹ Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance. Edited by M. Joseph Doohar and Vivienne Marquis, New York: AMA, 1950. p. 42.

[illegible]

by R. Joseph Hooper and Vivienne M. Hooper, New York, 1950, p. 25.

OBJECTIVES VERSUS MERIT RATING PLANS¹

It must be recognized that it is impossible to state definitely that one or another of the various merit rating systems is the best for any purpose. However, the generalizations made below, if taken as just that, will give an indication of what to expect with each type. Many considerations enter the picture, such as time and effort required and the need for the system to serve several purposes. Whatever advantage a particular system may have for serving one purpose may be outweighed by its disadvantages relative to other purposes.

1. High Accuracy

- a. Weighted Check List²
- b. Forced-Choice²
- c. Paired Comparison³
- d. Rank-Order³

¹ The Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 323.

² Suitable for obtaining performance relative to other persons or relative to a standard.

³ Suitable for obtaining performance relative to others.

It must be recognized that it is impossible to state definitely that one or another of the various methods being applied is the best for any purpose. However, the methods described here below, it seems to me, will give an indication of what is desired with each type. Many conditions exist in the design, such as time and effort required and the need for the operator to have a visual display. The system developed is a decision system and is not for solving one problem but is designed to be adapted to various relative to other problems.

1. High accuracy

a. Design of the system

b. Design of the system

c. Design of the system

d. Design of the system

2. The system is designed to be used in the design of the system

3. The system is designed to be used in the design of the system

4. The system is designed to be used in the design of the system

2. Aiding in Individual Development
 - a. Rating Scale with Comments
 - b. Weighted Check List
3. For Test Validations -- Comparison Systems
4. For Rating a Small Number of Persons
 - a. Rating Scales
 - b. Rank-Order
5. For Best Chance of Consistency¹
 - a. Comparison Systems
 - b. Weighted Check List

In the final analysis, the best system for a situation will be the merit rating plan specifically designed for that situation.

¹ Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 325

U. S. Office of Technical Assistance

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

6. *Relational Types* (1997) by Jeffrey D. Ullman

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 105–112

6. The value of ΔH is 100 kJ/mol.

అంతర్జాతీయ అంశములు

2. For more change at home.

To the first analysis, the best system for a situation

will be the most serious and potentially damaging for

1995, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006

Received 10/10/00, accepted 10/10/00

CHAPTER IV

CAUTIONS, DANGERS AND PRINCIPLES OF MERIT RATING

THE RATER

As stated previously, merit rating is not a measure of performance. It obtains opinions only. Therefore, it cannot be considered as a precise method. It consists of many variables among which the rater is the greatest of them all.¹ He can make a rating program operate with reasonable consistency, or he can make the very best plan operate inaccurately. The latter is by far the easier course to follow.

At times, the rating system may have inherent faults which cause errors. It may, for instance, not contain the traits that are required for the job under consideration, or the trait degrees may not be adequately described. Assuming that these faults are eliminated, the rater may be afflicted with one or a combination of the following:

¹ Knowles and Thomson list the primary sources of danger in any rating program as (1) the rater himself, (2) the rating form, (3) frequency of making ratings, (4) secrecy of results, and (5) lack of understanding.

Asa S. Knowles and Robert D. Thomson. Management of Manpower. New York: MacMillan, 1943. p. 162.

attached with one or a combination of the following:

investing that those taxes are eliminated, the taxes may be
or the treaty between may not be adequately described. In-
vesting taxes are paid for the 100 years consideration,
which cannot occur. It may be impossible, not contain the
As stated, the treaty states may have numerous factors

entirely. The treaty is by the treaty should be follow-
ing, or be can make the very best plan possible. In-
vesting taxes may be the treaty is the product of time all,
be considered as a private matter. It contains of many va-
riations. It contains variations only. Therefore, it cannot
be considered as a private matter. It contains of many va-

is a record previously, which makes it not a measure of

1
Knox and Thomas had the primary purpose of
disrupting the voting program in (1) the voter districts,
(2) the voting towns, (3) the county of voting towns, (4)
the county of voters, and (5) the state of Massachusetts.
See A. Knox and Thomas v. Thomas, Massachusetts
at Springfield, New York: Springfield, 1947, p. 105.

1. Halo Effect - the tendency to rate an individual rather consistently high, average, or low on each of the various traits depending on the rater's over-all impression of the individual.¹ Halo effect may or may not be entirely the fault of the rater. If considerable overlapping exists between traits, the error may be impossible for the rater to correct.²

2. Constant Error - this type of error has been described variously as central tendency, lack of spread, different standards, systematic error, etc. The basic result of all these errors is that the entire rating scale is not utilized. The good rater adequately distinguishes among the various ratees by using the full scale. The not-so-good raters are more apt to mark consistently high, but some also mark consistently low, or mark everybody average --

¹ The Personnel Handbook cites an example in which judgment and personality varied directly with production -- an unusual phenomenon, if true. This condition is frequently found in completed ratings.

Personnel Handbook, op. cit., p. 285.

² Dale Yoder. Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. p. 345.

1. Large Error - the tendency to make an individual

rather consistently high, average, or low in case of the
various results depending on the subject's state-all impression
of the individual.¹ Large error may or may not be entirely
the result of the test. If some bias is overlapping exists
between results, the error may be independent for the results
to be correct.²

2. Consistent Error - this type of error may occur in
results consistently in certain directions, such as of the
person's character, systematic error, etc. The results of
all these errors in that the error is not
eliminated. The error is systematically distinguishable among
the various results by using the same results. The error is
not only the error but is also consistently high, and also
also may be consistently low, or may vary in error.

1 The Experimental Handbook also has examples in which
judgments and personality studies are used in the
as a result of the test. This definition is the
quantity found in various studies.
Experimental Handbook, pp. 110, 111, 112.

2 This error is reported in the following
Baltimore, New York: Pearson-Gall, 1928, p. 110.

no very high nor very low marks.¹

3. Inconsistency - unless the rater is consistent in his ratings, nothing of value can be obtained from them. He may be inconsistent with himself -- a difference in consecutive ratings on the same man not justified by changed behavior, or he may be inconsistent with other raters who rate the same man. The first step is to train the rater to be consistent on consecutive ratings. When that has been accomplished, set about correcting his inconsistency with other raters. This is accomplished by comparison between successive ratings of the same individual by the same rater as well as by different raters.² Inconsistency because of the rater's lack of ability can be corrected somewhat by training. Allowance for any remaining

¹ Yoder describes the inclination of a rater to keep away from the extremes as central tendency, and a consistent tendency to over or under rate as a systematic error.

Yoder, op. cit., pp. 345, 348.

² As a matter of practice, more than one rater should rate an individual, provided more than one rater has opportunity to observe the ratee's performance on the job.

Mary Harper Wortham. "Rating of Supervisors," Industrial Relations Section, California Institute of Technology, Bulletin No. 11, p. 31.

Yoder, op. cit., p. 339.

Benge, op. cit., p. 54, item 7.

on very high and very low levels.²
 2. Indeterminacy - unless the series is constant in
 its position, nothing of value can be obtained from them.
 In any case, indeterminacy with itself -- a self-reference in some
 sensitive position on the same man has resulted in changed
 behavior, as we may be inconsistent with what we say and
 what we think. The first step is to build the rules
 to be consistent on determinative results. When first the
 man accomplished, not about controlling his indeterminacy
 with other people. This is accomplished by comparison in-
 stead of comparative results of the same behavior by the
 same person as well as by different people.³ Indeterminacy
 may become of the person's lack of ability and so con-
 sidered somewhat by behavior. Allowance for any remaining

1. Yoder described the limitation of a series to keep
 away from the extremes of constant behavior, and a constant-
 one behavior to keep on under the systematic error.
 Yoder, op. cit., pp. 342, 343.

2. As a matter of knowledge, more than one point should
 rest on individual, provided more than one series was spec-
 ically to observe the series' performance on the job.
 Mary Parker Follett, "Theory of Management,"
 Industrial Relations Section, Columbia University of New-
 York, Bulletin No. 11, p. 11.
 Yoder, op. cit., p. 334.
 Follett, op. cit., p. 34, 35, 36.

constant error between raters can be made by applying a correction factor.¹

Besides training to improve the rater, various other suggestions have been made for helping the rater improve his own performance. One suggestion is to have the ratee complete a rating on himself and then, as part of the development program, rater and ratee discuss both reports -- the one by the rater and also the one made on himself by the ratee.² This discussion between rater and ratee not only forces the rater to make more sincere judgments, but also will make it easier for him to do a good counseling job. Another suggestion for assisting the rater is to have him justify each trait degree selected by a specific comment on the rating form.³ Some favor a summarization of

¹ For a discussion on how to compute correction factors see: Wortham, op. cit., p. 25.

The Personnel Handbook, op. cit., pp. 326, 329, 332.
Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance, op. cit., pp. 156-158.

² Ewing W. Reilley and Bernard J. Muller-Thym. "Executive Development Today for Increased Profits Tomorrow," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 24, No. 6, May 1948. p. 407.

³ Yoder, op. cit., pp. 330, 336.
A sample form which incorporates comments to justify each trait degree has been reproduced in Appendix B.

constant work between them can be seen by applying a

conversion factor,¹

which is defined as follows: the ratio of the

suggestion rate to the rate of the suggestion

rate of the suggestion. The suggestion is the ratio of the

conversion factor to the ratio of the suggestion

rate of the suggestion, which is the ratio of the

rate of the suggestion and the ratio of the suggestion

rate of the suggestion. This is the ratio of the

rate of the suggestion to the ratio of the suggestion

rate of the suggestion. This is the ratio of the

rate of the suggestion to the ratio of the suggestion

rate of the suggestion. This is the ratio of the

rate of the suggestion to the ratio of the suggestion

¹ For a discussion on how to compute conversion fac-

tor see: Ward, G. L., 1951, p. 25.

The conversion factor, G. L., 1951, p. 25, 330.

Factorial analysis and experimental design, G. L.,

1951, p. 13-15.

² Factorial analysis and experimental design, G. L., 1951,

1951, p. 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

³ Factorial analysis and experimental design, G. L., 1951,

1951, p. 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

Factorial analysis and experimental design, G. L., 1951,

1951, p. 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

Factorial analysis and experimental design, G. L., 1951,

1951, p. 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27.

the overall value of the ratee to the organization.¹ Either of these last two recommendations tend to make the completed rating more objective, provided the comments are in operational terms, that is -- statements of fact rather than opinions or beliefs.² Users of merit rating must have faith that raters can eventually be trained to adopt common standards.³

VALIDITY

Validity relates to the extent to which ratings adequately differentiate among individuals in a group in terms of actual job performance or potential. Inaccuracies in this respect may be caused by an inadequate system or an untrained rater. Suggestions for improving both conditions have been discussed previously. In addition to training to reduce rater errors, it has been found that a properly designed rating form can be of great assistance in avoiding

¹ See copies of the Navy Fitness Reports -- Appendices C, D, E, and F, for some samples where summarization of overall value to the organization is required.

² E. C. Webster, A. Winn, and J. A. Oliver. "Case Study of Merit Rating Forms: Simplification and Reduction of Traits for Raters," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 5, March 1951. p. 415.

³ Wortham, op. cit., p. 26.

the overall value of the data to the organization.¹ Since
of these data two recommendations would be made the completed
rating more objective, provided the comments are in com-
pleted terms, that is -- statements of fact rather than
opinions or beliefs.² There is merit rating must have
with this rating and especially as related to other common
standards.³

VALIDITY

Validity refers to the extent to which ratings are
of actual job performance or potential. Inconsistency in
this regard may be caused by an inadequate system or an
unreliable rater. Improvements in improving both conditions
have been discussed previously. In addition to relating to
reducing rating errors, it has been found that a properly de-
signed rating form can be of great assistance in avoiding

1 See copies of the Navy Fitness Reports -- 4p-
Pamphlet 5, 6, 7, and 8, for some examples of the summary-
tion of overall value to the organization as required.

2 E. C. Webster, A. W. Hunt, and J. A. Dwyer, "Data
Study of Navy Rating Forms: Identification and Reduction
of Rating Errors," Personnel, Vol. 17, No. 2,
March 1951, p. 133.

3 Webster, op. cit., p. 134.

them. These will be discussed in the following section.

One way to test for validity is to compare the completed merit rating for an individual with some objective measure of that individual's job performance. This is possible only if the performance records are available and are truly representative of average performance.¹

RATING FORM DESIGN

The merit rating form should not look complex to the rater. Any mathematics involved in deriving a final index should not be placed on the forms. Such details can be handled better by the personnel department, or similar organization, upon completion of ratings.

¹ Randolph S. Driver of the Atlantic Refining Company, lists the following methods which he says have been used with varying success to determine validity:

(1) Comparison with some direct measurement of performance, i. e., production records, etc.

(2) Comparison with psychological tests purporting to measure the same ability.

(3) Comparison with work samples.

(4) Analysis of distribution of results.

(5) Analysis to determine the presence or absence of "halo effect."

(6) Follow-up procedures. A study of past records versus actual performance of an individual.

(7) Miscellaneous methods.

Mr. Driver feels that methods (1) and (6) have the best chance of being helpful at this time.

Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance, op. cit., pp. 60-65.

them. There will be discussion in the following chapter.

One way or two for writing is to compare the two

plans and see which one is better. This is the

method of the individual. The problem is that it is not

clear only if the performance is not available and the

very representative of the system.

Writing from memory

The main writing form should not look similar to the

text. The main writing form should be a final, final

should not be placed on the form. The data can be

included below by the personal department, as a final ex-

planation. The main writing form should be a final, final

I have to say that the main writing form should be a final, final

into the following section which is a final, final

with writing form to determine writing.

(1) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

with the main writing form should be a final, final

(2) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

with the main writing form should be a final, final

(3) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(4) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(5) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(6) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(7) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(8) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(9) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(10) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(11) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

(12) Comparison with the main writing form should be a final, final

In addition, there are features, which, if incorporated in the form, would tend to reduce errors. However, they also tend to increase the complexity of the form. The relative advantages and disadvantages must be weighed by the user. They include the following:

1. Arrange the form so that all persons are rated one trait at a time in order to counteract "halo effect."

2. Vary the position of the high and low trait degree descriptions. This forces the rater to read each trait degree carefully, rather than checking each trait approximately in a vertical line based on the halo effect of a few traits, or because of inherent rater tendency.

3. Indicate on the form the approximate percentage of any group that would normally be expected to have each degree of any trait. (Forced Distribution)

4. Provide space beside each trait degree so that rater can justify with comment the judgment made in each case.

5. Provide space for the rater to summarize his opinion of the overall worth of the man to the organization. This word picture should specifically touch on the strong points, shortcomings, corrective action recommended, suitability for promotion, training recommended, etc. Search-

In addition, there are features, which, at first sight, in the form, would lead to undue stress. However, that also found an increase in the complexity of the form. The relative advantages and disadvantages must be weighed by the user. They include the following:

1. Although the form as it is all present are listed one would at a time in order to understand "this effect."

2. With the location of the high and low parts of the description. This shows the user to read each part more carefully, rather than observing each part separately in a vertical line based on the main effect of a few parts, or because of inherent error tendency.

3. Indicate in the form the appropriate percentages of any group that would normally be expected to have each of the of any small (or even classified)

4. Provide space below each part to allow the user to justify with reasons the judgments made in each case.

5. Provide space for the user to summarize his opinion of the overall worth of the man to the organization. This word should appear separately from the other points, advantages, comparative action recommended, and ability for promotion, training recommended, etc. Search-

ing questions can be provided to draw out the type of information desired.

PRINCIPLES OF MERIT RATING¹

Based on phases of merit rating discussed so far in this study, some principles can be derived and will be stated herewith:

1. The merit rating program used must be tailor-made for the particular circumstances in which it is to function. There is no one best merit rating system for all situations.

2. Merit rating programs should be designed to serve specific objectives. Do not attempt to obtain answers from the program which it has not been equipped to give.

3. Know the disadvantages inherent in the types used. Realization of the disadvantages enables the user to take precautions. If more than one purpose is to be served, a

¹ For further discussion of principles, see also: Walter Dill Scott, Robert C. Clothier and William R. Spriegel. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. pp. 203, 205-207.

Knowles and Thomson, op. cit., 146-151, 155, 158, 160-162.

Rating Employees and Supervisory Performance, op. cit., p. 19.

Paul Pigors and Charles A. Myers. Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947. pp. 172-174.

Michael J. Jucius. Personnel Management. Chicago: Irwin, 1951. pp. 255-259.

The question can be provided to have the type of formation desired.

PRINCIPLES OF STATE TESTING
 Based on a number of state testing programs as far as this study, some principles can be derived and will be stated hereafter:

1. The state testing program must be tailor-made for the particular circumstances in which it is to function. There is no one best state testing system for all situations.
 2. State testing program should be designed to give specific objectives. No one should be exempted from the program which it has not been designed to give.

3. Know the characteristics inherent in the types used. Evaluation of the characteristics enables the user to make judgements. It may then one purpose is to be served, a

4. For further discussion of methodology, see also:
 Wilson, H. L. (1957). State Testing. New York: Macmillan.
 1957. No. 600-254.
 Wilson, H. L. (1957). State Testing. New York: Macmillan.
 1957. No. 600-254.
State Testing and Objective Evaluation, pp. 917-918.
 1957. No. 600-254.
State Testing and Objective Evaluation, pp. 917-918.
 1957. No. 600-254.
 Wilson, H. L. (1957). State Testing. New York: Macmillan.
 1957. No. 600-254.

combination of types may be required. This entails accepting an increasing number of disadvantages.

4. Do not expect exact answers from merit rating. It is an inexact method at best, depending on opinions about people rather than some direct measurement of their performance or personality.

5. Evaluate the job for which the individual is being rated. Without a job evaluation, there is no basis for determining which traits are applicable, nor any basis for insuring that all raters are using the same standards.

6. Behaviors and traits must be observable.

7. Traits and behaviors rated must be those related to performance on the job under consideration, whether it be present or future. No irrelevant traits should be listed. In the case of check list methods, the statements must apply. When comparison systems are used, the rater must take into account what constitutes overall job performance.

8. Avoid overlapping traits. Reduce number of traits until there is a real distinction between each of them.

9. The merit rating plan must have the whole-hearted support of top level management.

10. The program must be accepted by all hands involved

combination of these was to be avoided. This was the purpose.

The two following number of circumstances,

1. The two following number of circumstances, 12

is an interest which is not, depending on certain cases

people report that their interest in their person-

was to be avoided.

2. The two following number of circumstances, 12

is an interest which is not, depending on certain cases

people report that their interest in their person-

was to be avoided.

3. The two following number of circumstances, 12

is an interest which is not, depending on certain cases

people report that their interest in their person-

was to be avoided.

4. The two following number of circumstances, 12

is an interest which is not, depending on certain cases

people report that their interest in their person-

was to be avoided.

5. The two following number of circumstances, 12

is an interest which is not, depending on certain cases

people report that their interest in their person-

was to be avoided.

6. The two following number of circumstances, 12

other than top management. The goal to be aimed for is whole-hearted support by the entire organization, but the essential minimum for success is acceptance.

11. Raters must be educated in its purpose and trained in its use. They must understand the what and why, as well as the how of the merit rating program being used.

12. Ratees must understand the purpose of the merit rating program and its advantages to them in fairness, less favoritism, etc.

13. Rater must know the man he rates. Each ratee should be rated by at least two raters if possible. However, raters must be limited to those who can and do actually observe the performance of the ratee.¹

14. Completed merit ratings should be comparable. Successive ratings on the same individual must be consistent, whether marked by the same rater or not. Also ratings of a person in one area should be comparable with ratings of another individual in a different area, if both are being

¹ The rater may receive reports on a particular phase of the ratee's performance from an observer, but it is up to the man who knows him to correlate such bits of information and come up with a final rating. In this example, the rater might not actually observe every performance, but he observes most of them.

other than the management. The goal is to stand for the

whole-hearted support of the entire organization, not the

assorted claims for success in leadership.

11. Factors must be identified in the process and trained

in the past. They must understand the past and why, as well

as the how of the past's existing program being used.

12. Factors must understand the process of the world

existing program and the advantages to them in the past, less

theoretical, etc.

13. Factors must know the end of the world. Each factor should

be trained by at least one factor if possible. However, not-

ing what is likely to those who can and do actually do-

serve the performance of the world.¹

14. Designated world factors should be compared.

Successive factors on the same individual must be compared

and, whether known or not, the same must be done. Also factors

of a person in one world should be compared with factors

of another individual in a different world. If both are being

¹ The factor may receive reports on a particular phase
of the world's performance from an observer, but it is up to
the man who knows the observer must have a list of information
and come up with a final report. In this regard, the factor
might not actually observe every performance, but he ob-
serves each of them.

considered for the same job.

15. Traits and trait degrees must mean the same thing to each rater. Wording should be such that the rater can visualize which acts constitute a specific trait degree. Descriptions should be as objective as possible.

16. Discuss the rating with person rated. The completed rating should be in such form that it can be shown to and discussed with the ratee.¹ Due to the nature of the forced-choice type, it should be supplemented with a trait list to abide by this principle.

17. Limit dissemination of completed ratings to the ratee and those in management who need to know. Otherwise, keep material confidential. Confidence in the fairness of the merit rating program will be improved thereby.

18. Check and review completed forms for rater consistency, rater errors, and to maintain continuous evaluation of the ratees. This should be done by a central agency.

19. Continuously evaluate the program for improvements. This includes improvement in form design, descrip-

¹ Probably the most valuable by-product of the merit rating systems is the opportunity afforded those rated to find out what others think of their ability, so that they may continue to improve themselves.

15. Under the new law

to meet policy. Working under the new law can

attain the same results as the old law.

Consequently, the new law is better.

16. Under the new law

placed under the new law is the same as the old law.

to and the new law is the same as the old law.

the new law is the same as the old law.

that is to say, the new law is the same as the old law.

17. Under the new law

and those in the new law are the same as the old law.

Under the new law

the new law is the same as the old law.

18. Under the new law

the new law is the same as the old law.

Under the new law

the new law is the same as the old law.

19. Under the new law

the new law is the same as the old law.

20. Under the new law

the new law is the same as the old law.

the new law is the same as the old law.

tions, etc.

20. Publicize achievements of merit rating plan in order to increase confidence in and acceptance of the program. In this way its effectiveness and worthwhileness in terms of effort and cost will be evident.

ST. PETER'S BAPTIST CHURCH, 1000 1/2 N. 1ST ST., ST. PETERSBURG, FLA. 33705

It is not the responsibility of the Government to provide for the welfare of the people. It is the responsibility of the people to provide for the welfare of the Government.

CHAPTER V

THE NAVY FITNESS REPORT

HISTORY¹

Toward the end of the last century, the Navy Department became aware of the need for evaluating naval officers in a manner which would facilitate the comparison of officers in each grade as a basis for administrative actions, such as detail and selection for promotion. In 1891 a "Report on the Fitness of Officers" was published for service use.² This report provided a means for commanding officers to comment on characteristics important to the effectiveness of the officer being reported on. These characteristics were listed as (1) ability to command, (2) manner of performing duties, (3) general conduct, (4) sobriety, (5) health, and (6) condition and efficiency of command. It provided that any special duty to which the officer had been assigned be indicated along with a

¹ From data furnished by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C.

² A copy of this form is reproduced -- Appendix C.

THE NAVY FITNESS REPORT

HISTORY

Towards the end of the last century, the Navy Department

was faced with the need for evaluating naval officers

in a manner which would facilitate the comparison

of officers in each grade as a basis for administrative

actions, such as detail and retention for promotion. In

1901 a "Report on the Fitness of Officers" was published

for service use.¹ This report provided a means for com-

paring officers for promotion on administrative importance

to the effectiveness of the officer being reported on.

These recommendations were listed as (1) ability to com-

mand, (2) manner of conducting duties, (3) general conduct,

(4) energy, (5) health, and (6) knowledge and efficiency

of command. It provided that any special duty or station

the officer had been assigned to indicated along with a

¹ This data furnished by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C.

² A copy of this form is reproduced in Appendix B.

statement of how well this duty had been performed. Also provided on the form was space for the commanding officer to make any remarks which he felt important toward assisting in the officer's complete evaluation.

This form underwent a complete revision in 1912. The number of characteristics to be considered was increased and it was required that reporting officers evaluate officers on a 0 to 4.0 scale. Since then several revisions have taken place.¹

REVISING A FITNESS REPORT

The methods by which fitness report forms are created are many and varied. The form revised in August 1943 (Appendix G) was evolved by the introduction of changes

-
- ¹ See sample forms in Appendices as follows:
- D - Report on the Fitness of Officers (April, 1923)
 - E - Report on the Fitness of Officers (July, 1928)
 - F - Report on the Fitness of Officers (Sept., 1930)
 - G - Report on the Fitness of Officers (Revised 8/43)
 - H - Officer's Fitness Report (Revised 6/45)
 - I - Report on the Fitness of Officers (Revised 3/51)
 - J - Officer's Fitness Report, USMC (Revised 7/50)
 - K - Chief and First Class Petty Officer Evaluation Sheet (New 12/49)

These are by no means all the revisions that have taken place. They do indicate the efforts being made by the Armed Services to correct deficiencies when they appear, and to overcome rater errors by changing the form design from time to time.

statement of how this data was used and how it was
provided on the same was again for the remaining officer
to make any possible error in the important cases. This
is the officer's responsibility.

This form was used a complete revision in 1911. The
number of observations to be considered was increased
and it was required that reported officers observe at-
least on a 5 to 10 scale. After then several revisions
have taken place.

REVISION A FURTHER REPORT

The outline of which follows report form are divided
into two main parts. The first section is about 1911
(Appendix B) was revised by the introduction of changes

The outline form is reproduced as follows:
1 - Report on the status of officers (April, 1911)
2 - Report on the status of officers (July, 1911)
3 - Report on the status of officers (Sept., 1911)
4 - Report on the status of officers (Nov., 1911)
5 - Officer's status report (Nov., 1911)
6 - Report on the status of officers (Nov., 1911)
7 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
8 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
9 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
10 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
11 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
12 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
13 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
14 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
15 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
16 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
17 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
18 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
19 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
20 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
21 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
22 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
23 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
24 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
25 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
26 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
27 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
28 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
29 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
30 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
31 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
32 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
33 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
34 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
35 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
36 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
37 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
38 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
39 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
40 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
41 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
42 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
43 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
44 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
45 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
46 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
47 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
48 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
49 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
50 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
51 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
52 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
53 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
54 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
55 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
56 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
57 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
58 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
59 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
60 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
61 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
62 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
63 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
64 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
65 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
66 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
67 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
68 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
69 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
70 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
71 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
72 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
73 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
74 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
75 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
76 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
77 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
78 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
79 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
80 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
81 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
82 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
83 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
84 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
85 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
86 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
87 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
88 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
89 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
90 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
91 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
92 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
93 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
94 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
95 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
96 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
97 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
98 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
99 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)
100 - Officer's status report, Nov. (Nov., 1911)

shown necessary by continued usage. As needs for more information arose, additional items were added until the form became so cumbersome that it could no longer be used. It was then streamlined and the growing process started again. The 1943 revision was made by a group of industrial personnel experts on duty in the Navy. It was engineered to meet the specific needs of selection and detail.

The latest form in use (Appendix I) resulted from a study of all contemporary forms and those used in the past. This study included the Army form, the Air Force form, the Marine Corps form, and all previous Navy forms. The results obtained from each were carefully considered. The study indicated that, however imperfect they might have been, the results obtained from the old Navy form (Appendix G) were the most satisfactory. The most recent form (Appendix I) is simply a reengineering of the older form with the items that were not being used eliminated. Some of the detailed instructions formerly issued with the older forms were purposely omitted because it was thought that fewer injustices would result if each reporting senior were permitted to use his own judgment in painting the desired picture of his junior's performance.

It has been found that the task of revising the fitness

shown necessary by continued usage. It needs the more so-
lution some, additional items were added until the form
became so cumbersome that it could no longer be used. It
was then streamlined and the printing process started again.
The 1949 revision was made by a group of industrial person-
nel reported on early in the Navy. It was designed to meet
the specific needs of collection and detail.
The latest form in use (Appendix 2) resulted from a
study of all contemporary forms and those used in the past.
This study included the Army form, the Air Force form, the
Navy form, and all previous Army forms. The re-
sults obtained from each were carefully analyzed. The
study indicated that, however numerous they might have
been, the results obtained from the old Army form (Appen-
dix 6) were the most satisfactory. The most recent form
(Appendix 1) is simply a renumbering of the older form
with the items that were not being used eliminated. Some
of the detailed instructions formerly issued with the older
form were purposely omitted because it was thought that
further instructions would result in each reporting section was
permitted to use his own judgment in making the analysis
picture of his Junior's performance.
It has been found that the task of revising the form

report form is complicated by many factors. Some of these are indicated below:

1. The individual, and often conflicting, ideas of numerous naval officers must be consolidated into a representative form which will be acceptable to the service and administratively feasible.

2. Changing conditions in the Navy require emphasis on new developments. There is often a tendency to let the new material added get out of balance with the fundamental material desired in such a report.

3. Each new form and system has eliminated some of the disadvantages of the preceding system, but has also introduced new abuses and troubles which were not apparent in the previous form.

4. The strong feeling of fellowship among naval officers and the necessity to maintain morale results in the majority of officers being rated in the top ten per cent of their grade. Obviously, in any grade seventy per cent of the officers cannot be in the top ten per cent, but with the system in effect in 1950, this was apparently the case if one could believe the rating section of the fitness reports.

5. Test runs were made where the marks had no bearing

report form is completed by each student. Some of these

1. The first, and often completely blank of
newspaper and other sources may be recommended into a paper-
andative form will be acceptable to the student and
satisfactorily finished.

2. The second condition is the first paper copy
as now presented. There is also a feature to the two
and material added for the student with the following
material desired in each copy.

3. The third and fourth are finished form of
the statement of the printing system, and also in-
formation on other and various other copy systems
in the printed form.

4. The fourth and fifth are finished form of
the statement of the printing system, and also in-
formation on other and various other copy systems
in the printed form.

5. The fifth and sixth are finished form of
the statement of the printing system, and also in-
formation on other and various other copy systems
in the printed form.

6. The sixth and seventh are finished form of
the statement of the printing system, and also in-
formation on other and various other copy systems
in the printed form.

on the career of the officer concerned. Under these conditions results were generally valid. When the rating form was actually put into use, however, the marks were higher than in the test run and, from past experience, they usually continue to become still higher.

6. There is a natural reluctance on the part of reporting seniors, or on the part of most other individuals for that matter, to make unfavorable comment on their subordinates for official purposes.

7. There should be some continuity of any new form with previous forms if any continuous evaluation is to be made from the complete fitness report file.

A study of the reports submitted in all previous Navy systems indicated that while check marks assigned in the various categories tended to be concentrated in either the topmost or bottom brackets, the comments were generally more constrained. For this reason users of fitness reports have come to rely on the comment section rather than the numerical marks. It is believed, therefore, that improvements can best be gained by simplifying the numerical sections and retaining the comment section.

Probably the hardest task connected with any revision is to implement the use of the new fitness report form in

on the order of the other members. Under these two-
sided results were generally valid. When the rating form
was actually put into use, however, the scores were higher
than in the test run and, from that experience, they would
if continue to become still higher.

6. There is a natural reluctance on the part of re-
porting officers, or on the part of most other individuals
for that matter, to give unfavorable comments on their sub-
ordinates for official purposes.

7. There would be some similarity of any new form
which provides for an official evaluation as to be
made from the complete fitness report file.

A study of the reports submitted in all previous Navy
systems indicated that while some matter assigned in the
reports and queries seemed to be concentrated in either the
payment or bottom brackets, the comments were generally
more unbalanced. For this reason many of fitness reports
have come to rely on the comment section rather than the
numerical rating. It is believed, therefore, that improve-
ment can best be gained by simplifying the numerical sec-
tion and retaining the comment section.

Probably the number rank concerned with and revised
is to improve the use of the new fitness report form in

a way which will secure and maintain the wholehearted cooperation of the reporting seniors.

FEATURES OF THE CURRENT FITNESS REPORT

The current Navy fitness report¹ includes the following features:

(1) There is incorporated a list of traits with a definition of what each is meant to convey to the rater. There are four degrees of each trait, plus a column to be used when the trait has not been observed. Three of the degrees have a description stated in operational terms, while the fourth degree is labelled "Unsatisfactory" with no additional description. The trait degrees are further divided into two equal boxes to represent a higher or lower amount of that degree. In all, there are thirteen traits to be rated. This type rating form can be described as a multiple-step rating scale.

(2) It is mandatory that the completed report be shown the ratee if there are any unfavorable comments. A space has been provided in which the rater must indicate whether the report has been shown to the ratee and what, if any,

¹ A copy of the latest fitness report has been included as Appendix I.

a way which will secure and maintain the wholeness of the
system of the reporting service.

STANDARD OF THE REPORTING SERVICE

The standard of the reporting service is as follows:

the standard:

(1) There is to be a list of units with a de-
scription of each unit in words as given in the report.
There are two forms of each unit, one a column to be
used when the unit has not been described, one of the
units have a description added in additional forms,
while the fourth degree is labeled "unclassified" with
no additional description. The first degree and further
divided into two equal parts to represent a third or lower
amount of this degree. In all, there are thirteen units
to be used. This type of unit can be described as a
multiple-unit rating scale.

(2) It is mandatory that the completed report be shown
the case if there are any additional comments. A space
has been provided in which the report may indicate whether
the report has been shown to any other and when it was.

I A copy of the latest financial report has been in-
cluded as Appendix I.

improvement has been noted.

(3) There is included an additional report on current performance. Each of the performance items must be graded by a numerical mark on a scale of 0.0 to 4.0. A mark below 2.5, in any of the nine spaces provided, constitutes an unfavorable entry and requires that the report be shown to the ratee.

(4) There are two critical statements that must be answered by the rater -- what he thinks of the particular officer in respect to others of the same rank and approximate service, and a statement of how anxious the rater would be to have the ratee under his command in time of war.

(5) Another feature that is critically examined by selection boards is the comment section of the report. It is in this section that the rater must make an appraisal of the ratee. This space cannot be left blank.

(6) Space for certain administrative information is also provided. This additional data includes such things as length of present tour of duty, various duties assigned during the period of the report, reference to any commendable or adverse reports concerning the ratee during the period, etc.

(3) There is included an additional report on current performance. Each of the performance items must be graded by a minimum grade of a grade of 0.0 to 4.0. A mark below 2.0, in any of the nine areas mentioned, constitutes an unfavorable report and requires that the report be made in the next period.

(4) There are two official statements that must be submitted by the unit — one at the time of the performance of the unit in regard to items of the same kind and especially the service, and a statement of the unit at the time of the review. The review must be made in time of the review.

(5) Another feature that is especially mentioned by the Institute is the fact that the report must be an appraisal of the unit. This report must be made in the next period.

(6) There is certain administrative information that is also provided. This additional information must be made at the time of the review, and at the time of the review, various items assigned during the period of the report, reference to the department, and on advance reports concerning the time during the period, and.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the fitness report is to provide for each officer a complete and continuous record¹ of all time spent in an active duty status. The record must be in sufficient detail to permit assignment to tasks for which best qualified or to those in which additional training is needed (depending on the objective which best meets the current needs of the United States). It should also permit a selection board to obtain a sufficiently accurate picture of the officer to arrive at a valid decision concerning his qualification for selection without the necessity of calling him before the board in person. From time to time, various other information is required on the fitness report in an attempt to gather everything in one report instead of requiring several administrative reports. While this method has merit in reducing the number of reports, it tends to make the completed fitness report unduly long and time-consuming for the rater to complete. For that reason, there is a continual shifting between longer and shorter forms, i.e., attempts to delete information

¹ The complete fitness report file on each officer is maintained in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C.

The purpose of this fitness report is to provide for each officer a complete and continuous record of all time spent in an active duty status. The record must be in sufficient detail to permit assignment to duty for which best qualified or to times in which additional training is needed (depending on the objective which best meets the current needs of the United States). It should also present a balanced basis to obtain a sufficiently complete picture of the officer to arrive at a valid decision concerning his assignment for action within the Navy. It is of course the duty of the officer to report, from time to time, various other information as required on the fitness report in an attempt to gather everything in one report instead of requiring several administrative reports. While this method has merit in reducing the number of reports, it tends to make the required fitness report bulky and time-consuming for the officer to complete. For that reason, there is a constant shifting between longer and shorter forms. A few attempts to obtain information

The complete fitness report file on each officer is maintained in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D. C.

that is no longer needed versus the desire for other information which it appears advisable to obtain.

WEIGHT GIVEN FITNESS REPORTS IN SELECTION FOR PROMOTION

The fitness report is the primary document on which all promotions and details are based. However, the exact weight given an officer's fitness report by any particular selection board when considering him for promotion is indeterminable. The precept for any selection is very broad.¹ It simply asks the board to select from the officers eligible the ones that the board considers to be the best fitted for promotion. The number to be selected is set forth in the precept. Therefore, other factors such as professional reputations, qualifications for specific jobs, record in combat, etc., all enter into the picture and the weight accorded each factor is a decision that each board must make for itself.

The information furnished the selection board is that contained in the fitness report jacket, the selection board jacket, material concerning the officer which is held by

¹ See Appendix L for sample precept convening a selection board appointed to select line officers for promotion to Rear Admiral.

that it no longer needed various the number for other in-
formation which is appropriate to be retained.

RECENT HISTORY REPORTS IN RELATION TO THE

The Finance report is the primary document on which

all transactions and details are based. However, the exact

weight given to officer's Finance report is not necessarily

related to the weight given to the Finance report in the

selection board. The process for any selection is very broad.¹

It simply takes the board to select from the officers who

have the most that has been considered to be the best fitted

for promotion. The number to be selected is not fixed in

the process. Therefore, other factors such as professional

reputation, qualifications for specific jobs, record in

service, etc., all enter into the process and are weighed

against each other as a decision that each board must

make for itself.

The information furnished the selection board is that

contained in the Finance report. In fact, the selection board

issues, material concerning the officer which is held by

the selection board.

1- See Appendix I for sample board members' report.

Selection board members are selected from officers for their

ability to select.

the Judge Advocate General, and the medical record for each individual eligible for consideration.¹

Quite naturally, the service reputation of the officer under consideration and the personal knowledge that board members may have relative to any circumstances incident to an unusual fitness report are considered in addition to the written records.

The fitness report carries major weight in the selection board's determination in the case of junior officers. As the prospective selectees become more senior, the fitness report carries less and less weight relative to other factors.

As the service reputation of the senior officers is better known and because the fewer prospects to be considered by the more senior boards permits more time for consideration of each individual, these factors have an increasingly greater influence in the selection of senior officers than in the selection of junior officers.

¹ The selection board jacket contains a recent photograph, information on background -- both prior to naval service and in service, citations, awards, discipline, and miscellaneous correspondence. The material from the Judge Advocate General's office will contain records of courts, investigations, etc., if any.

the Judge Advocate General, and the military records for each individual eligible for consideration.¹

Quite naturally, the service reputation of the officer under consideration and the personal knowledge and board members may have relative to any circumstances incident to an unusual fitness report are considered in addition to the written records.

The fitness report carries major weight in the selection board's recommendation in the case of junior officers. In the prospective selection process more weight, the fitness report carries less and less weight relative to other factors.

In the service reputation of the senior officers is better known and because the lower prospects to be considered by the more senior boards carries more than the consideration of less individuals, these factors have an especially greater influence in the selection of senior officers than in the selection of junior officers.

¹ The selection board board considers a review of the officer's information on background -- such as his service record and in service, education, training, discipline, and miscellaneous information. The material from the Judge Advocate General's office -- all records records of courts, investigations, etc., is not.

CHAPTER VI

MERIT RATING IN INDUSTRY

As stated in Chapter II, merit rating in industry got its first real impetus in the United States shortly after World War I. This was largely, if not entirely, due to the experimentation conducted by the U. S. Army. The U. S. Civil Service had also been using merit rating for some time (since 1910); but most companies that adopted merit rating plans probably started with a form of the Army system. Each company gradually modified the plan to suit individual needs. In 1926, Mr. John W. Dalzell, of the Ferro-Concrete Company, estimated that most companies had gotten away from the Army rating system by that date.¹

Industry's approach to merit rating has been to develop a plan which can be used primarily at the worker and first line supervisory levels. There is relatively little evidence of its utilization in administrative management, as is the case in the Navy. Rather, the emphasis in industry's upper operative and all administrative levels is on training plans

¹ Harvey G. Ellerd. "Rating Supervisors," Production Executives Series No. 42, AMA, 1926. p. 11.

designed to give the executive an overall grasp of the organization. Some of the training plans currently in favor are: (1) job rotation, (2) participation in high level decisions through management boards or committees,¹ (3) some role playing (but usually at the lower supervisory levels), and (4) utilization of special college training programs (case study methods, etc.). Actual selection for promotion within these levels seems to be by favorable recommendation of the immediate superior, and by approval of the Board of Directors if the promotion is to a position of top level responsibility.

Where the situation is such that those in top management know all prospective promotees in the organization who will be ready for top level billets within the next several years, it is probably absurd to go through the mechanics of merit rating to aid in the final selection of the promotee when a vacancy occurs. In these instances, all-around training, followed by designating understudies, might be a more realistic and satisfactory approach. This will apply to most concerns until they grow to several times their present

¹ Charles Perry McCormick. The Power of People. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. 136 pp.

designed to give the executive an overall grasp of the organization, some of the existing plans currently in force and (1) job rotation, (2) participation in high level decisions through management boards or committees, (3) some jobs playing (not usually as the lower supervisory levels).

and (4) utilization of special skills involving programs (some along special lines). These various programs for participation within these levels would be in the form of a series of of the immediate supervisor, and by approval of the Board of Directors if the procedure is to a decision of the Board of responsibility.

These are situations in which there is no simple- minded view of executive participation in the organization and will be ready to be used within the next several years. It is probably better to go through the mechanics of having them so that in the final analysis of the procedure when a company comes to some decision, all-around participation, followed by executive participation, which is a more realistic and satisfactory approach. This will apply to most companies until they are in a position to help present

² Office of the Secretary, U.S. Dept. of State, 1947, 13 pp.

sizes.

In the larger industrial enterprises, this line of reasoning should not be followed. Surely, concerns comprised of many establishments must have great difficulty trying to compare possible promotees to top management. Their possible sources would include administrative executives located all over the United States and also, perhaps, in other parts of the world. In such cases, a form of merit rating would seem to be an answer to the problem. However, within the libraries at the Ohio State University, no concrete evidence of the use of merit rating to select executives for promotion to the top management level has been found. There is plenty of evidence that industry is pretty well sold on the use of merit rating for employees through the supervisory level. Halsey gives indication that industry is also seriously considering the use of merit rating for higher executives when he says,

"The chief executive of a nationwide business with a dozen or more stores or factories in different parts of the country needs a carefully designed rating form to help him organize his thinking about the top-flight executives under his supervision, just as much as does the supervisor of twenty or twenty-five clerks or machine-tool operators -- probably more so. The importance of the decisions involved is so great that it is worth while to spend considerable time and effort in designing a detailed form which is exactly applicable even

1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 26

In the larger industrial corporations, some line of
 reasoning should not be followed. Surely, common sense
 of many administrations must have been following
 trying to employ possible procedure to top management.
 Their possible business would involve administrative ques-
 tions looked all over the United States and also, perhaps
 in other parts of the world. In such cases, a form of net-
 it taking would seem to be an answer to the problem. How-
 ever, within the limits of the Ohio State University,
 no separate evidence of the use of net is being in school
 executives for promotion to the top managerial level has
 been found. There is plenty of evidence that industry is
 pretty well sold on the use of net's trial for employees
 through the executive level. Early gives evidence that
 industry is also seriously considering the use of net's
 giving the highest executives when he says,

though there may be only a few persons to be rated. Such was the opinion of the chief executive of a group of about twenty large stores ..."¹

The observation is herewith advanced that industry is alert to the possibilities of merit rating as an aid in selecting executives for all levels of management, but does not as yet actually make full use of it for that purpose. In an attempt to lend weight to this assumption, queries were sent to several concerns. The replies indicate utilization of merit rating as follows:

1. Johnson and Johnson have an executive rating form which seems to be quite adequate for its purpose. Utilization of the form is at the discretion of each division head. Most of these men use the completed ratings in analyzing replacement and training needs.
2. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company also uses an executive merit rating system. They call it "Analysis of Employee Progress." These rating sheets are required for all field salary employees including store managers, district sales supervisors, assistant district managers, district operating managers, etc. The ratings are required every six months.

¹ George D. Halsey. Making and Using Industrial Service Ratings. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. p. 69.

though there was only a few persons to be
present. This was the occasion of the first ex-
ecutive of a group of about 25-30 people.
..."

The situation is somewhat advanced that money is
always to the government of each nation as an aid in
leading economic for all levels of management, but that
not as yet actually more (but not as it for people).
In an attempt to find which is this situation, people
were sent to several countries. The people involved will
function at each level as follows:

1. Johnson and Johnson have an extensive rating form which
seems to be quite adequate for its purpose. Utilization of
the form is at the discretion of each division head. But
of them may use the completed rating in making response
and one rating code.

2. Georgia Tech and Ruston Company also use an extensive
rating rating system. They call it "Analysis of employee
Progress". These rating system are repeated for all field
early employees including those managers, division sales
representatives, assistant division managers, division purchasing
managers, etc. The system was repeated every six months.

1. George C. White, Manager and Sales Representative
Vice President, Ruston Company and Johnson, 1944, p. 25.

Upon completion, they are reviewed by the Division Personnel Managers and then forwarded to the central personnel agency for analysis and file. The rater must appraise the employee being considered and rate him in one of the following categories: "A" - Employee doing very acceptable job on present position and ready for immediate advancement; "A(-)" - Employee satisfactory, shows promise, will be ready for advancement within one year; "B(+)" - Acceptable but not ready for advancement; "B" - may qualify for present job but definitely needs assistance of superior to retain job; "C" - To be replaced immediately.

Both of the above executive rating programs are good examples of the possibilities of merit rating. They could be integrated very easily into a plan of executive inventory control.¹ From the description furnished with the forms, it appears that, even with these forms, there is no

¹ Executive Inventory Control is a method of establishing executive reserves now used by several companies. It is basically an analysis of the potential of the executives on hand and the development therefrom of a replacement table (or chart) for all or some of the executive positions in the organization.

N. G. Asbury. Personnel Administration at the Executive Level. Annapolis, Md.: U.S. Naval Institute. 1948. pp. 32-43.

H. W. Haight. "Case Studies in Executive Development: I," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 1, July 1950. p. 23.

Upon completion, they are reviewed by the Division Bureau-
 and Management and then forwarded to the central personnel
 agency for analysis and filing. The review must appraise the
 employee being considered and rate him in one of the follow-
 ing categories: "A" - Employee doing very satisfactory job
 on present position and ready for immediate advancement;
 "A(-)" - Employee satisfactory, shows promise, will be
 ready for advancement within one year; "B(+)" - Satisfactory
 but not ready for advancement; "B" - Not qualified for pro-
 motion but definitely needs assistance in preparation for
 this job; "C" - To be rejected immediately.

Each of the above categories is further divided into two
 examples of the possibilities of early rating. They could
 be interpreted very easily into a plan of executive devel-
 opment. From the description furnished with the
 form, it appears that, even with these forms, there is no

Executive Inventory General is a method of select-
 ing executive personnel now used by several companies.
 It is basically an analysis of the personality of the man-
 ufacturer on hand and the development of a person-
 nality (as shown) for all or some of the executive posi-
 tions in the organization.

H. D. Ashby, Personnel Administration in the Man-
 ufacturing Industry, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937, pp.
 32-33.
 H. D. Ashby, "Some Studies in Executive Development",
Personnel, Vol. 27, No. 1, July 1936, p. 23.

attempt to carry executive merit rating above the operative management level. To validate this opinion would require a better knowledge of the make-up of the jobs for which ratings are required. However, it is not too great a step from rating operative executives to its application for administrative executives also.

An additional consideration is the fact that many industrial executives of top management caliber are brought into the organization from other sources, rather than promoted from within. A merit rating program would probably be of less value than other available methods for determining which of several executives outside the organization would be best. Likewise, it would be of little help when comparing available talent within and without the establishment. If, by some sort of common agreement among industrialists, it becomes socially unacceptable to pirate executive talent from other concerns, perhaps there could be some cooperation in making available the ratings of executives who are in excess of the needs of one concern to other concerns that do need such executives.

five minutes after
the speaker returned to the Association for Adminis-
tration. However, it is not clear a day from this
latter knowledge of the nature of the day which might
management have. The speaker said that would require a
statement to have someone with having about the speaker's

[illegible]

CHAPTER VII

COMPARISON OF NAVAL AND INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AND PROMOTION PROBLEMS

Although industry has not yet begun fully to utilize merit rating at the top administrative level, it has made great strides in developing its use at the worker and lower supervisory levels. It was through study of the writings of many industrial users of merit rating that the principles given in Chapter IV were evolved. On the other hand, whereas records show that the Navy has used merit rating for at least sixty years, the system used for the petty officers (supervisory personnel) and other enlisted men has, until very recently, been of a very simple type. The first advance of any significance was the introduction in 1949 of the "Chief and First Class Petty Officer Evaluation Sheet" (Appendix K). The Navy, then, has been working for better merit rating for executives above the first line supervisor, while industry has been improving merit rating for first line supervisors and below. It may be a propitious time for industry and the Navy to study the advances accomplished by each other.

There is a distinct difference in the problems facing

CHAPTER VII

TESTING OF WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT TRAINING AND PROMOTION PROGRAM

Although industry has not yet begun fully to utilize weight testing at the top administrative level, it has made great strides in developing its use at the various and lower supervisory levels. It was through study of the various of many industrial cases of weight testing that the present plan given in Chapter IV was evolved. On the other hand, numerous studies show that the Navy has used weight testing for at least sixty years. The studies show that the Navy (float) (supervisory personnel) and other enlisted men had until very recently, been of a very simple type. The kind of any significance was the introduction in 1907 of the "float and float class" (float class) (float class) (float class) (float class). The Navy, then, has been testing for weight testing for decades and the first time supervisory, while industry has been testing weight testing for the first time supervisory and below. It may be a possibility also for industry and the Navy to study the various accomplishments by each other.

There is a distinct difference in the problem facing

industry and the Navy in the preparation of top level executives. Although both follow the basic administrative principles in the running of their organizations, industrial leaders are not required to have an additional highly specialized knowledge at that (top) level.¹ The naval top line executive must, in addition to his administrative ability, have knowledge of the sea -- on, over, and under. He must know the limitations of his equipment, have an insight into strategy and tactics that an enemy might decide to use and be able to originate and execute a counter plan to combat it, etc., etc. For this reason, it is seldom possible to bring in outside executives to fill top naval line billets, whereas a top level executive in industry frequently is brought into the business organization at that level. The special knowledge of a senior naval line officer is not similar to any other occupation, whereas administrative knowledge picked up in one concern may be just as applicable in

¹ Industrial executives ready for general administrative responsibilities will require a high order of intelligence, a broad background and experience, considerable maturity, and a broad point of view. Some practical experience is always valuable, but specific practical experience is less important here than it is for a staff or operative executive.

Ralph C. Davis. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940. p. 38.

industry and the way in the preparation of top level executives. Although most follow the basic administrative principles in the making of their organizations, industrial leaders are not required to have an additional highly specialized knowledge at each level.¹ The level top executives must, in addition to the administrative ability, have knowledge of the way — not over, not under, but must know the distinction of his responsibility. News on business news and reports that are being written down to him may be able to originate and conduct a business plan to conduct it, and, etc. For this reason, it is not possible to have an executive responsible for this top level this ability. However, a top level executive in industry responsibility is broader than the business responsibility at each level. The special knowledge of a number of other lines of work is not able to say about organization, whereas administrative knowledge should stand up in one corner may be just as significant to

¹ Industrial executives ready for general administration also responsibilities will require a high order of intelligence, a broad background and experience, considerable training, and a broad body of vision. Some general experience is always required, but specific practical experience is less important than it is for a staff or operative executive.

Walter D. Davis, Industrial Organization and Management, New York: Macmillan and Company, 1930, p. 10.

another concern dealing in an altogether different product.¹ In fact, a considerable number of retired flag officers from the various armed forces have been holding down top level civilian jobs with evident success. This seems to bear out the theory that the principles of top management are similar wherever found and that general, rather than specific, technical competence is required of the top management executive in industry.

To insure that sufficient talent will be available when needed, each naval officer receives continuous training as he advances in rank. Industry has not been so persistent in its executive training programs. For one thing, executives in industry are more apt to move from one concern to another, whereas the number of U. S. Navies available to a naval officer are distinctly limited. Industry has found that pick-

¹ Fayol recognized that most of the qualities and knowledge desirable in a higher manager are the same in any field. He listed the following: (1) health and physical vigor, (2) intelligence and mental vigor, (3) moral qualities, (4) sound general education, (5) managerial ability, (6) general knowledge of all essential functions, and (7) competence in specialized activity of the organization. Commenting further on these desirable qualities, he says, "The individual, commercial, political, military, and religious leaders of comparable rank are alike as far as the first six categories go, and differ only in the matter of specialized activity characteristic of the enterprise." But he says further that general abilities carry an executive to the forefront after his technical ability brings attention.

Henri Fayol. General and Industrial Management, Translated by Constance Storrs. New York: Pitman, 1949. pp. 73-74.

Another common finding is an increasing difference between
 in fact, a considerable number of revised field officers from
 the various armed forces have been holding over on level
 civilian jobs with related incomes. This means that our
 the theory that the percentage of top management and studies
 however found and seen generally, rather than specific, man-
 what response is required of the top management executive
 in industry.

It is true that civilian leaders will be available when
 needed. Such civil leaders however are not available in
 as numerous as they are. Industry has not been as successful in
 its executive training program. For one thing, executives
 in industry are more and more from one source to another,
 whereas the number of U. S. leaders available to a small or-
 ganization are relatively limited. Industry has found that this

1
 Payot recognized that one of the qualities and know-
 ledge desirable in a higher manager and the same in any field.
 He listed the following: (1) breadth and depth of vision, (2)
 intelligence and mental vigor, (3) moral qualities, (4) sound
 personal education, (5) executive ability, (6) general know-
 ledge of all essential functions, and (7) acceptance of spec-
 ialized activity of his organization. Concerning the first six
 these desirable qualities, he says, "The industrial manager
 of the future must be able to do the first six activities as
 and better only in the matter of specialized activity con-
 siderable of the organization." But he says further that the
 real difficulty comes in selection in the executive staff and
 technical ability during selection.

Harold Kelley, General and Industrial Management, Trans-
 lated by Clarence Brown, New York: Simon, 1932, pp. 73-74.

ing an executive for further training, such as by the use of an understudy method, may tend to discourage others not so selected. Furthermore, the selectee himself may become discouraged if he must wait too long for the expected advancement.¹ Mandell points out that in the Armed Services the dangers of early selection are reduced by a number of factors.²

1. Graduates of military, naval, and Coast Guard academies who are not suitable for higher executive positions can fulfill their careers by high quality work in technical or supervisory jobs.

2. The Services provide extensive training and development opportunities which compensate for the initial handicaps of some persons. The training and development program is a continuous one, whereas in civilian life

¹ Tead says, "Many a potential top administrator is lost to his best effectiveness by delays (for whatever reason) in giving him the chance to measure his talents against greater responsibilities."

Ordway Tead. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951. p. 204.

Freeman and Taylor sum up their concept of the argument against prior selection of executives in industry as follows: (1) By survival of the fittest, there will always be some man ready to step into any situation when it arises. (2) Personal capacities cannot be measured outside the situation where it is actually used. (3) Errors in selection can be virtually eliminated by pirating proven talent. Leadership demonstrated in rival or related firms can be paid to serve new masters.

G. L. Freeman and E. K. Taylor. How to Pick Leaders. New York: Funk & Wagnalls in association with Modern Industry Magazine, 1950. p. 4.

² Milton M. Mandell. "Problems in Executive Selection," Advanced Management, March 1952. pp. 17-18.

ing an executive for further training, such as by the use of an understudy method, may tend to discourage others not so selected. Furthermore, the selected himself may become discouraged if he must wait too long for the expected advancement.¹ Randall points out that in the armed services the dangers of early selection are reduced by a number of factors.²

1. Graduation of military, naval, and Coast Guard schools where one may not achieve the highest executive positions can fulfill their careers by high quality work in technical or supervisory jobs.

2. The services provide extensive training and development opportunities which compensate for the initial hardship of some careers. The training and development programs are a continuous one, whereas in civilian life

¹ Ford says, "Many a potential top administrator is lost to his best effectiveness by being (for whatever reason) in giving him the chance to measure his talents against greater responsibilities."

George Stoddard, The Art of Administration, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931, p. 204.

Freeman and Taylor sum up their concept of the executive selection problem as follows: (1) By selection of the right man, some will always be found who are ready to step into any position when it arises. (2) Personal selection cannot be assumed to be the best way where it is actually used. (3) Errors in selection can be virtually eliminated by placing known talent, tested and demonstrated in what or related lines can be paid to serve the company.

O. E. Freeman and E. S. Taylor, How to Pick Leaders, New York: Funk & Wagnalls in association with McGraw-Hill, 1930, p. 4.

² Milton W. Randall, "Problems in Executive Selection," Advanced Management, March 1934, pp. 17-18.

executive training programs tend to be of too brief duration.

3. The selection process in the Armed Forces is such that a greater proportion of potential executives will be produced than in civilian life.

As stated previously, the number of executives in an industrial establishment who are being considered for promotion to top level responsibilities will, except in the larger organizations, be relatively small. In such cases, all promotable executives will be known personally by their seniors. There is, therefore, no reason in the small concerns for a merit rating system to help the top managers decide which executive to promote.

The larger concerns, on the other hand, have much the same problem in selecting the best executives for promotion to top management as that present in the Navy. Writers on the subject recommend a span of executive supervision between three and nine or ten for the average top level executive.¹ These are recommended figures which are often exceeded. It appears possible, in case the top executive

¹ Ralph C. Davis. The Fundamentals of Top Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. pp. 272-276.

107

3. The selection process in the armed forces is such that a greater proportion of potential executives will be produced than in civilian life.

as stated previously, the matter of membership is an individual relationship and one being handled for persons who to top level representatives will accept on the large an organization, be relatively small. In such cases, all possible activities will be known personally by their members. There is, therefore, no reason in the world to work for a credit rating system to help one top management level which operates on a personal basis.

1. The first step in the process of determining the value of a company is to determine the company's assets and liabilities. This is done by reviewing the company's balance sheet and other financial statements. The value of the company's assets is then compared to the value of its liabilities to determine its net worth.

New York: Bureau and Library, 1931. no. 117-118.
Edwin C. Davis, The Development of the Negro

vacates his job, that some or all of his immediate subordinates will be considered for the position. With the possibility of as many as a dozen candidates (or more) for a top level position, merit rating could certainly aid in the final selection.

In the Navy each year, one out of approximately thirty-six eligible Captains must be selected to fill each top level (flag rank) vacancy.¹ It has long been recognized that this selection is a very serious matter.² It has further been recognized that a merit rating system is needed to assist the Selection Board in making its decision. This aid is available in the fitness reports for each naval officer. As pointed out in Chapter V, the fitness reports carry considerable weight, but other factors such as known

¹ In 1951, there were approximately 1470 Captains eligible for promotion from which number 36 were actually selected for promotion.

² The following extract from the United States Naval Regulations and Naval Instructions, 1913, p. 74-I, is as applicable today as when it was written: "The fitness of an officer for the service, with respect to promotion and assignment to duty, is determined by his record. Reports on fitness and special reports are decisive of the service career of the individual officer, and have important influence on the efficiency of the entire service. The preparation of these reports is, therefore, one of the most important and responsible duties of superior officers."

...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...

...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...

...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...

...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...
...the ... of ... the ...

performance over the years of service will also carry considerable weight. Generally, a poor fitness report will cause the candidate to fail of selection. The reverse does not automatically hold true, however.

performance over the years of service will also come out
clearly in the report. Generally, a good record report will
show the student is full of initiative. The teacher does
not automatically give credit, however.

For the student to be successful in his studies
he must be able to learn by himself. The teacher's
role is to guide him. The student must be able to
work out his own problems. The teacher must be able to
help him. The student must be able to work out his
own problems. The teacher must be able to help him.
The student must be able to work out his own problems.
The teacher must be able to help him. The student must
be able to work out his own problems. The teacher must
be able to help him. The student must be able to work
out his own problems. The teacher must be able to help
him. The student must be able to work out his own
problems. The teacher must be able to help him.

The student must be able to work out his own
problems. The teacher must be able to help him. The
student must be able to work out his own problems.
The teacher must be able to help him. The student must
be able to work out his own problems. The teacher must
be able to help him. The student must be able to work
out his own problems. The teacher must be able to help
him. The student must be able to work out his own
problems. The teacher must be able to help him. The
student must be able to work out his own problems.
The teacher must be able to help him. The student must
be able to work out his own problems. The teacher must
be able to help him. The student must be able to work
out his own problems. The teacher must be able to help
him. The student must be able to work out his own
problems. The teacher must be able to help him.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

EVALUATION OF FITNESS REPORT

The Navy fitness report will be evaluated by comparing it against the features that seem to work best for industrial users of merit rating. With this in mind, comparison will be made with recommended form design and also with the principles of merit rating. Both of these subjects were covered in some detail in Chapter IV. Therefore, recommendations will be considered in the same sequence as previously discussed. In each case, the recommendation will be restated, followed by comment as to whether the fitness report and recommendation seem to be in accord.

A. Rating Form Design - a Comparison

Rating form should not look complex to the rater.

The current fitness report form is not unduly complex. The administrative details have been reduced to a moderate amount. There is no final index that must be computed, either by the rater or by a central agency.

Note: The following features are recommended if careful consideration indicates that the added disadvantages do

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

EVALUATION OF VITRINE TESTS

The Navy claims vitrines will be evaluated by comparing is against the knowns that seem to work best for structural usage of metal testing. With this in mind, comparison will be made with recommended test design and also with the principles of metal testing. Both of these subjects were covered in some detail in Chapter IV. Therefore, recommendations will be considered in the same sequence as previously discussed. In each case, the recommendation will be tested, followed by comment as to whether the vitrine report and recommendation seem to be in accord.

A. Loading from Cracks - a Comparison

Loading from cracks and load transfer to the water.

The purpose of this report form is not merely to compare the relative merits of the two methods but to compare the results. There is no time limit for this comparison. It is to be made by the test or by a central agency.

Note: The following discussion and recommendations are intended to be considered in relation to the above discussion.

not outweigh the advantages.

Rate all persons on one trait before proceeding to the next trait.

This tends to eliminate the halo effect arising from trying to judge all the traits of one individual before considering the same traits of each of the other subordinates. The form arrangement is such that there is only one ratee on each fitness report. However, it would be possible for the rater to consider all officers under his jurisdiction on one trait at a time by making up a rough form for that purpose. In making trait degree judgments, both present performance and future potential must be considered. Upon completion of grading all traits for every subordinate, each officer's grades would be transferred to his own smooth report and the rough form destroyed. Due to the manner in which fitness reports are utilized for promotion, assignment to duty, etc., and in view of the confidential nature of each officer's report, it would not be feasible nor desirable to file reports with several officers per trait on each sheet.¹

¹ The Writer has used this method. It seemed to him that the resultant ratings were less biased, i.e., more nearly a true picture of the ratee, than when each ratee was considered on all traits without trait-by-trait comparison with others of the same relative rank and experience.

and similarly the respondents.

State all persons on our list below according to the

new list.

This seems to eliminate the main source of error in-
ing to jump all the while of our individual before con-
sidering the new state of each of the other individuals.
The time arrangement is such that there is only one refer-
ence to each person's report. However, it would be possible for
the reader to consider all officers under his jurisdiction
on one list as a time by taking up a rough form for that
purpose. In making these degree judgments, each person
performance and future potential must be considered. Upon
completion of reading all cards for every individual,
each officer's grade would be transferred to his own report
report and the report form completed. Due to the manner in
which these reports are utilized for promotion, assign-
ment to duty, etc., and in view of the confidential nature
of each officer's report, it would not be possible nor de-
sirable to list reports with several officers per list on
each sheet.

The writer has used this method. It seemed to him
that one potential problem would be that, if, for
example, a card should be sent to the wrong officer and
was considered on all cards without being so-
lution with others of the same relative rank and experience.

Vary position of high and low trait degrees.

The position of trait degrees is not varied from line to line. However, the direction has been reversed from the previous form, i.e., unsatisfactory is toward the right on the new form whereas it was on the left on the superseded model.

Indicate "normal distribution" of any group.

The older form included an indication of the percentage of any group that would normally be expected to possess a trait in any specific degree. Due to the difficulties described below, this feature has been discontinued.

In 1946, after forced distribution had been a feature of the fitness report for a year or more, it was estimated that raters were rating between thirty and fifty per cent of all naval officers in the space labelled "within top 10%." By 1950 the number of officers "within top 10%" had increased to an estimated seventy per cent. One explanation for this phenomenon is that many raters were confusing normal distribution of people's abilities with a percentage scale or grade for performance on the job. It was like grading an examination; job performance was being marked on a 0 to 100% basis. If an officer's performance of duties met the requirements of the rater, the ratee was con-

Very location of this and the other

The position of this subject is not stated from the
line. However, the division has been provided from the
previous town, i.e., approximately in the same place as
the new town which is not at the same place as the
model.

Indicate "general description" of the town

The above town is located in the vicinity of the
any group that would possibly be expected to be
in any specific manner. Due to the different
before, this feature has been described.

In 1900, after the association had been a feature
of the town which for a year or more, it was
that there were some other things and that the
of all novel efforts in the town which was
1901. By 1902 the number of efforts within the town
increased to an estimated twenty per cent. The
for this purpose is that any subject was
and distribution of people's interests with a
and of funds for government on the 1st. It was
resulting in a commission; its members were
on a 5 to 1000 scale. It is an officer's
line and the responsibility of the town, the town was not

sidered to be ninety per cent or better in job performance ("within top 10%"); if he did his job roughly eighty per cent satisfactorily, he was rated to be "within next 20%"; and, if he did a mediocre job on the order of half what the rater desired, he was rated fifty per cent which brought him into the "within middle 40%" group. Because of this "man-job" thinking on a feature of the form designed for man-to-man comparison, practically no one received ratings below the middle forty per cent unless they were completely unsatisfactory. Usually, in such a case, the rater skipped the column designated "within next 20%" and graded the unsatisfactory officer "within bottom 10%". The result then was that most officers were graded seventy per cent or better on their jobs, a few were doing half a job, and a few were unsatisfactory. Most raters felt that the preponderance of their officers were doing ninety per cent or better work, as indicated by the bunching of ratings "within top 10%."

Require rater to justify his judgment on each trait degree.

No space is provided for justification of each trait degree selected. There is, however, provision for summarization of the ratee's worth to the organization.

...to be nearly as good as better in job performance
(“within top 10%”) if he had his job exactly as
best and necessary, he was asked to be “within top 10%”
and if he had a superior job on the order of half what
he had desired, he was asked fifty per cent within twenty
into the “within middle 40%” group. Because of this “top-
job” thinking on a feature of the long designed top ten-
was considered, practically no one received ratings below
the middle forty per cent unless they were completely un-
satisfactory. Usually, in such a case, the rating stopped
the entire designed “within top 10%” and placed the wo-
rksatisfactory officer “within bottom 10%”. The results thus
and that most officers were graded nearly top half or bet-
ter on their jobs. A few were doing well a few, and a few
were unsatisfactory. These were left with the proportion
of their officers were doing nearly top half or better work,
as indicated by the grouping of ratings “within top 10%”.
Relative rating of quality his judgment on work still do-

Notes.

No space is provided for justification of each rating degree
assigned. There is, however, provision for explanation
of the rating's basis in the organization.

Require rater to summarize overall worth of ratee.

This is required (see above). There are good instructions on the form which clearly indicate the type of subject to be included in this summary.

B. Principles of Merit Rating - a Comparison

The Navy fitness report will next be compared with the principles of merit rating that have seemed valid to users and students of merit rating.

Must be tailor-made.

The Navy has discovered that there is no "one best" system of merit rating, as evidenced by the changes incorporated from time to time. Although the present revision was developed after consideration of forms used by all armed services, the product represents a continuing attempt to obtain a rating form which is tailored to best fit the needs of the Navy, rather than a general form.

Should be designed to serve specific objectives.

There is a question whether the report has not been designed to serve so many purposes that it does not serve any of them as well as it could. Some of the objectives which it attempts to serve are: (1) as an aid in selecting for promotion, (2) as an aid in proper assignment to duty, (3) as an indicator of the ratee's value to the Navy in his

Further work is suggested under the following

This is suggested (see above). There are good indications on the form which shows the type of subject to be included in this summary.

B. Summary of the results - a summary

The New York report will be prepared with the following of early testing that have been raised in view and should be well known.

What is to be done

The New York Director's report is a "one page" report of early testing, as outlined by the program described from time to time, although the program revised was developed after consultation of some work by all other workers. The program represents a working design as of late a testing form which is believed to be the same as the New York report form.

Summary of the results is given in the following

There is a question whether the report has not been adapted to copy so many purposes that it does not serve any of them as well as it could. Some of the objectives which it attempts to serve are: (1) as an aid in selection for personnel; (2) as an aid in program assignment to staff; (3) as an indication of the value of the New York to the

present job, (4) as a device which may be used for ratee improvement, (5) as an indicator of the rater's estimate of the ratee's value in time of war, (6) as a means of comparing the ratee with those of his contemporaries known to the rater.

Know the disadvantages of the merit rating system used.

The disadvantages of the fitness report are probably not too well known to the raters. This study brings to light some possible disadvantages and advantages. The possible disadvantages are stated, where applicable, under each principle of merit rating. A further discussion will be undertaken in the next section -- "Conclusions."

Do not expect exact answers.

This precaution seems to be understood by most raters.

Evaluate the job for which the individual is being rated.

This principle does not appear to be followed. Each rater has his own conception of what the job is or should be and operates accordingly. It may well be that it would be impossible to make a job description for an officer of any particular rank.

Behaviors and traits must be observable.

All listed qualities are so described in operational terms

present job, (4) as a better paid way of doing for work

improvement, (5) as an indicator of the state's attitude

of the state's value to that of war. (6) as a means of

giving the state with those of his own countrymen to

the state.

There are advantages of the state's policy

The advantages of the state's policy are probably not too

well known by the state. This study seems to light some

possible disadvantages and advantages. The possible dis-

advantages are stated, where applicable, under each possible

of each policy. A further discussion will be undertaken in

the next section -- "Conclusions".

Do not expect some answer

This question seems to be answered by each policy.

Examine the top for which the individual is

interested.

This question seems to be answered, but rather

has his own conception of what the job is or should be and

concerns himself. It may well be that it would be im-

possible to make a few suggestions to an officer of the

particular task.

Examine the state's policy

All listed questions are to be answered in individual cases

on the fitness report that they are observable. However, there may be traits that are not applicable to all ranks.

Behaviors must be related to performance.

The job under consideration may be the present or a future one. The fitness report does not differentiate between those traits required for the present and future jobs. This can only be justified if it is determined that an Ensign's and an Admiral's jobs require the same traits.

Avoid overlapping traits.

Some traits on the fitness report might be considered to overlap. For example: "intelligence," "judgment," and "initiative" seem to shade into one another; the same appears to be true of "force" and "perseverance." The remaining traits do not seem to infringe on one another.

On the United States side they are operated, however, there may be people that are not familiar with all kinds.

Behavior was related to personality.

THE TOP THREE COUNTRIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, CANADA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM.

and an American's love for the new world.

How familiar are you with the following concepts?

overleaf. For example: "Institution: 'Institution', Ref: 'Ref'".

14-00000

—almost half the population of the United States.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Must have wholehearted support of top level management.

This is the case.¹

Must be accepted by all hands involved.

It is.¹

Raters must be educated in its purpose and trained in its use.

This has not been done. The assumption was apparently made that the detailed instructions accompanying each previous revision of the form would be sufficient. No other concerted action was made to enlighten the rater on the existence and evils of such things as "halo effect," "constant error," "consistency," and the like. The newest form contains no detailed instructions at all except in regard to the "comment section."

¹ Merit rating has been a part of the U. S. Navy for such a long time that it has become traditional. The United States Naval Regulations and Instructions, 1913, pages 71-I through 74-I, gave detailed instructions on reporting the fitness of officers. Article 1715 of the Regulations for the Government of the Navy of the United States, dated February 25, 1893, gave instructions on the same subject. Records prior to that date are not immediately available.

A report on the fitness of every enlisted man and officer must be made periodically. The report on the senior naval officer is submitted by the Secretary of the Navy. Fitness reports on all other Navy personnel are made by their superior officer.

Current instructions on naval fitness reports for officers are contained in the Bureau of Naval Personnel Manual, 1948, Article B2202; and in Article 1701, U.S. Navy Regulations, 1948.

Ratees must understand purpose and its advantages to them.

Here again, instructions have been insufficient.

Rater must know the man he rates.

This is true in all but the largest commands. Even in those larger commands, the senior officer signs the report, but receives advice from those officers who are the immediate superiors of the officer being rated.

Completed ratings should be comparable.

This feature is particularly difficult to accomplish in the Navy, where officers are serving all over the world under a variety of conditions. Likewise, it is particularly necessary that ratings be comparable if they are to be of any value. There is a continuing attempt to make ratings comparable through changes in the form.

Traits and trait degrees must have the same meaning to each rater.

The traits and trait degrees are stated in operational terms, but are general rather than specific. If the terms were really specific, it would be necessary to have a slightly different fitness report for each rank. Were that the case, action more in keeping with each rank could be objectively described.

Japan was a great power and its influence in

form.

But again, American power was increasing.

Japan was not the only power in Asia.

This is true in all the largest powers. Even in those

large countries, the action often goes the other way.

Power is not always gained from those who are the

opponents of the other great powers.

Political power is always in the hands of

This power is sometimes difficult to recognize in the

past, where it is not always clear that the world is

not a collection of small powers. However, it is

very clear that the world is not a collection of

small powers. There is a growing tendency to see

power in the hands of the few.

There are two great powers in the world

and they are the United States and

The United States and Japan are the two great powers in the world.

But are they not the two great powers in the world?

They are not the two great powers in the world.

They are not the two great powers in the world.

They are not the two great powers in the world.

They are not the two great powers in the world.

Discuss rating with ratee.

This is not mandatory, except in the case of unsatisfactory reports. Reports are available for perusal at any time of-
ficer presents himself at the Bureau of Naval Personnel in
Washington, D. C.

Keep merit ratings confidential (other than with ratee).

This is done.

Maintain continuous evaluation of the ratee.

This is done so that selection boards will always have an
up-to-date record of the officer at any time. It is also
required for detail purposes. However, there is no apparent
attempt to review forms for the purpose of determining rater
error or consistency except when such information is needed
to determine average tendencies, etc., when revising the
form. Evaluation for rater improvement through training and
education is not done.

Continuously evaluate program for possible improve-
ments in form design, descriptions, etc.

This is done periodically.

Publicize achievements of the rating plan.

This is not done.

CONCLUSIONS

Merit rating is a valuable aid in painting a word picture of an individual. It can be described as a method which can assist a rater to make better judgments of each ratee's worth. Of course, the use of merit rating will not help a rater who does not follow the rules or observe the precautions. For the rater who does follow them, there is the reward of more fairness to ratees and the ability to skim off the cream for promotions, particular assignments, etc. What is the result? The answer is better morale and better promotees.

What part does merit rating have in the selection for promotion of the best top level executives in the Navy? The answer to that question cannot be given in definite terms. The fitness report is used by selection boards when considering Captains for promotion to flag rank. The proportional weight it has compared with other factors such as service reputation, combat record, etc., can not be stated. As a matter of fact, the proportion undoubtedly changes with each appointed board. There seems to be strong evidence that a good fitness report does not insure promotion. There is equally strong evidence that a poor fitness report will insure failure of selection for promotion.

An analysis of the fitness report form has indicated that most of the industrial writers' recommendations either are being used, or that there is good reason for deviation therefrom. The record in regard to following the principles of merit rating is not quite as good. These variances will be discussed below:

The Navy may be trying to accomplish too many objectives with the fitness report. The validity of this statement would have to be studied by the statisticians. On the other hand, there is continual pressure to increase the number of items of information that the fitness report can be designed to furnish. All in all, perhaps the present report represents the nearest to a happy medium that can be obtained.

The average rater probably is hazy as to the disadvantages of the fitness report. It would be much better if he were well enough aware of them to avoid some of the pitfalls of rating. In contrast, there is every indication that the designers of the fitness report are well alerted to the disadvantages of the system. It may be that instructions issued by the designers from time to time would obviate the necessity of keeping each rater informed of various disadvantages. Unfortunately, sufficient of these instructions

An analysis of the various reports has indicated that most of the industrial groups' representations appear to be being made on a basis of good reason for their position. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups.

The first report is being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups.

The second report is being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups. The reports are being received in the following order: first, of course, is the report on the general situation of the country, then the report on the situation of the various industries, and finally the report on the situation of the various groups.

seem to be lacking.

There appears to be no effort to make job evaluations for each rank that a rater could use for comparing his subordinates' performance against a standard. It may, due to the variety of duties that must be performed by any officer, be impossible to make a job description that would be of any value. Certainly, that would seem to be the critical question.

A doubt arises whether the practice of using the same fitness report form for all ranks is the best solution. This policy is also followed in Civil Service Efficiency Reports, but provision is made for leaving certain spaces blank, depending on the type position being graded. There would appear to be so little relation to the traits needed in an Admiral compared with those required of an Ensign that different fitness reports would be justified.

There is a lack of rater training. At the level being considered, that is, Captains who are rated by Admirals, there should be no problem. The years of experience in observing and rating officers should make additional instructions unnecessary. However, Admirals were apparently as confused by "forced distribution" as anyone else, if one can judge by the number of Captains rated "within top 10%."

[illegible]

Be that as it may, there are many more officers who are not experienced but must act as raters than there are experienced raters. If all officers, whether now acting as raters or not, were better informed concerning the purpose of fitness reports, they would be better able to rate others when that becomes necessary.

Along the same lines as discussed in the previous paragraph is the need to publicize the achievements of the rating program throughout the Navy. A better understanding of its accomplishments would give greater meaning to each step in the rating process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that a new fitness report be designed which would be used for Captains and Admirals only. This report could apply to all Captains and Admirals, or be limited to Admirals and the more senior Captains, who are within a year or two of consideration for promotion to flag rank. By limiting its applicability, the system could be made more accurate: traits could be more specific and the number rated being relatively small would permit use of a comparison method if desired. There are probably other additional ways in which accuracy could be improved. Referring back to the section on objectives versus merit rating plans

The fact is that, from the very first, the two
institutions have been in contact with each other
in the most friendly manner. In all efforts, whether in the
past or present, the two have worked in perfect
harmony, and it is only to be expected that in the future
they will continue to do so.

It is also true that in the present
there is no need to discuss the merits of the
two institutions. It is a fact that the two
are working in perfect harmony, and it is only to be
expected that they will continue to do so in the future.

CONCLUSION

It is a fact that the two
institutions have been in contact with each other
in the most friendly manner. In all efforts, whether in the
past or present, the two have worked in perfect
harmony, and it is only to be expected that in the future
they will continue to do so.

in Chapter III, it would seem that the primary objective in this case would be accuracy in differentiating between officers. Other considerations, such as aiding individual development, would not be a particular problem. The systems with the best record for accuracy possibilities are the weighted check list, forced-choice, paired comparison, and rank-order. The system actually selected would depend on such factors as which one would be most acceptable to the officers involved as raters and ratees.

2. The second recommendation is that more intensive training of raters be undertaken. As an example of the need in this regard, the action that might have been helpful when it was found that the forced distribution feature was not working according to plan will be speculated upon. An analysis of the trouble might have been made and further instructions written, the offending feature eliminated from the form, or lecture teams dispatched to instruct raters on a Navy-wide basis, etc., etc. Instead, most raters did not realize that their ratings were practically useless. And the worst part of this lack of training is that it still persists. Under such conditions, comparability of ratings is largely accidental in spite of the effort expended to develop the best possible fitness report form.

[illegible]

3. The next recommendation is to make it mandatory that each officer (other than those officers covered by the "promotee to top management level" report described in the first recommendation) be shown his fitness report or a statement be required to indicate why the rater did not consider such a move to be desirable in that particular instance. Admittedly, there are certain possible disadvantages to showing the fitness report. For example, Halsey¹ points out that the rater may hesitate to give truthful ratings. However, he joins many other writers on the subject of merit rating in recommending that as a long range policy, ratings be shown to the ratee.²

¹ George D. Halsey. Making and Using Industrial Service Ratings. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944. pp. 117-118.

² Mary Wortham Harper points out that the act of rating without reviewing that rating with the ratee is to lose much of the value of the plan. She further mentions companies who discuss ratings only with those whose performance is unsatisfactory. She feels that to overlook the positive and pleasant side of giving recognition for work well done is to overlook an easy way to build morale.

Wortham, op. cit., p. 27.

Tiffin, in discussing the same subject, says that the rater is more apt to rate properly if he knows that he will have to talk over completed ratings with the ratee.

Joseph Tiffin. "Merit Rating: Its Validity and Techniques," Personnel Series No. 100, AMA, 1946. pp. 14-23.

3. The first recommendation is to make it mandatory that every officer (other than those officers concerned by the "provision for his management level" report submitted in the first recommendation) be shown the fitness report on a basis that he is required to indicate why the report did not consider such a move to be desirable in that particular instance. Additionally, there are several possible disadvantages in knowing the fitness report. For example, history, past, and future the fitness report may be used in five different ways. However, the fitness report should be used in the subject of merit rating in recommending such as a long range policy, rating in showing the value.

2. George D. Wilson, Editor and Chief, Industrial for-
Vine Publishing, New York, 1944, pp. 117-118.

[illegible]

4. Finally, it is recommended that further study be given to the feasibility of establishing job evaluations for each rank. These job evaluations would be an invaluable aid to raters as a standard against which actual job performance could be compared.

It is possible that the following is a list of the

names of the persons who have been given the following

names: There are no names given in the following

and the names of a person who has been given the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

names are given in the following: There are no names given in the following

APPENDIX A

THE FIRST RECORDED EFFICIENCY REPORT IN ARCHIVES
OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT, August 15, 1813

Lower Seneca Town
August 15th, 1813

Sir:

I forward a list of the officers of the 27th Regt. of
Inftry. arranged agreeable to rank. Annexed thereto you will
find all the observations I deem necessary to make.

Respectfully,
I am, Sir,
Yo. obt. Servt.

Lewis Cass.

27th Regt. Infantry

Alex, Deniston - Lieut. Col., Comdg. A good natured man.

Clarkson, Crolins - first major. A good man, but no officer.

Jesse D. Wadsworth - 2d major - an excellent officer.

Captain Christian Martel) -	
" Aaron T. Crane)	
" Benj. Wood)	
" Maxwell)	
Shotwell) -	A man of whom all unite in speaking ill. A knave de- spised by all.
" Thomas Earle		Indifferent, but promises well.

APPENDIX 1

THE FIRST KNOWN CHINESE EVIDENCE IN AMERICA
BY THE NEW DOCUMENT, August 18, 1912

Chinese Evidences
August 1902, 1912

1912

I received a list of two children of the first page of
entry, arranged according to date. Arranged in this way
find all the evidences I have mentioned to date.

Respectfully,
I am, Sir,
Yr. Obedt. Servant.

David C. Clegg

First Page, Inventory

Also, included - First, Col., Clegg. A good record was.
Clegg, David - First page. A good record, not so correct.
David C. Clegg - 18 pages - an excellent record.

Chinese Evidences
August 1, 1902
First, 1902
Second, 1902
Third, 1902
Fourth, 1902

A man of whom all know in
agencies all a man de-
scribed as all.

Inventory, not finished yet.

Chinese Evidences

Captain Allen Reynolds	An officer of capacity, but imprudent and a man of violent passions.
" Danl. Warren Porter) Strangers but little known) in the regiment.
1st Lieut. Jas. Kerr Thos. Darling) Merely good, nothing promising.
" " Wm. Perrin Danl. Scott Jas. I. Ryan Robert McElwrath) Low vulgar men, with the) exception of Perrin. Irish) and from the meanest walks) of life -- possessing nothing of the character of officers and gentlemen.
" " Robert P. Ross) Willing enough- has much to learn - with small capacity.
Hall) Not joined the regiment.
2nd Lieut. Nicholas G. Garmer) A good officer but drinks hard and disgraces the service and himself.
" " Stewart Elder) An ignorant unoffending Irishman.
" McConkey) Raised from the ranks, ignorant, vulgar and incompetent.
" James Garrey) A stranger in the regiment.
" Darrow) Just joined the regiment - of fine appearance.
" Piercy Thomas G. Spicey) Raised from the ranks, but) all behave well and promise to make excellent officers.

2nd Lieut. Oliver Vance)	All Irish, promoted from
" Royal Geer)	the ranks, low vulgar men,
" Miars)	without any one qualifica-
" Crawford)	tion to recommend them -
" Clifford)	more fit to carry the hod
		than the epaulette.
 " John G. Scholtz)	Promoted from the ranks.
" Francis T. Wheeler)	Behave well and will make
		good officers.
 Ensign Rehan)	The very dregs of the earth.
		Unfit for anything under
		heaven. God only knows how
		the poor thing got an ap-
		pointment.
 " John Brown)	Promoted from the ranks-men
Ryon)	of no manner and no promise.
 " Charles West)	From the ranks. A good
		young man who does well.

All right, I'll be right back.
 The trouble is, the police want
 without any more questions
 time to examine the case -
 have the car away from the
 scene the apartment.

Transferred from the bank.
 Police will not allow
 good officers.

The very design of the bank,
 built for banking money
 money, but only money the
 the bank failed to ex-
 pect.

Transferred from the police
 at the moment and no further.

That is, the police, I hope,
 would not let down well.

End of the...
 Royal...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

John D. ...
 ...

Ensign ...

John Brown
 ...

Ensign ...

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE OF MERIT RATING FORM ON WHICH COMMENT IS REQUIRED TO JUSTIFY EACH TRAIT SELECTED¹

Name Date
INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING: Read carefully all factor definitions and accompanying instructions before you begin to rate any employee. This is your appraisal of the employee's job performance during the past six months (three months in the case of probationary ratings). Under each factor select the degree definition which most nearly fits the employee and in the space provided for REMARKS tell why you selected that degree.

RATING FACTOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	POOR	REMARKS
Appearance	Exceptionally well-groomed. Appearance a definite asset in selling.	Neat - well-groomed. Conforms with store dress standards.	Appears generally good. Endeavors to meet store dress standards.	Appearance not in conformance with store standards.	
Manner & Sales Etiquette	Unusually pleasant, sincere, courteous, arouses interest by own enthusiasm - convincing, friendly.	Shows above average sales courtesy and interest. Pleasant manner.	Sufficiently courteous to avoid antagonizing customers - fair interest and enthusiasm, not consistent.	Manner abrupt, indifferent, condescending or insincere.	

¹ Extracted from complete form used by Miller and Rhoads.

APPENDIX C

(Report on Officers under U. S. Navy Regulation Circular No. 86, September 10, 1891. A separate blank to be used for each Officer.)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS.

FORM A.

Name.

Rank.

W. S. S. Commanding W. S. S.

Station or duty.

Period covered by this report, from

to

1. Ability to command.
2. Manner of performing duties.
3. General conduct.
4. Sobriety.
5. Health.
6. Condition and efficiency of command.
7. If any special duty has devolved upon him, state its nature, and how it was performed.

8. Remarks.

I certify on honor that I believe the entries herein made are true and impartial, and that I have communicated unfavorable mention, as directed.

U. S. N.

Comdy.

NOTE. Under "Remarks," refer to any special reports made in accordance with Par. V, Regulation Circular No. 86, within the period covered by this report. Answers to queries from 1 to 6 inclusive shall be either "Excellent," "Good," "Tolerable," or "Not good," and must be written by the officer signing the report. Should the answer to any query be "Not good," or of an unfavorable nature, the reasons for such answer must be clearly stated, and a copy of that portion of the report furnished to the officer concerned, who shall be granted a reasonable time to prepare such written statement in regard to it as he may desire to make which statement shall be endorsed and forwarded with the report. Should the officer not desire to make a statement that fact shall be stated.

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION BY ORDER OF
THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

APPENDIX D

N. NAV. 443

(April, 1923.)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS.

(To be submitted in accordance with Section 5 of Chapter 2, U. S. Navy Regulations, 1920.)
Report to be typewritten, except that columns and question 14 need not be.

The following six questions to be made out by the officer reported on:

....., Grade, U. S. N.
(Surname first.)

Ship or station Period from to

1. Regular and additional duties.

2. Official residence (home)
(See Art. 135 (2), U. S. N. R., 1920.)

3. Next of kin. (Relationship) Name Address

4. Number of dependents entitled to Government transportation
Give age and sex of each child less than 21 years old.

5. Proficiency in foreign languages, stating which ones, and ability therein

6. My preference for next duty is:
(a) Sea Fleet
(b) Shore Location

(Signature.)

Following to be made out by Reporting Officer:

7. Reporting Officer: Name Grade, U. S. N.

8. Reporting Officer's official status relative to officer reported on

9. Employment of ship during period of this report

10. To what degree has he exhibited the following qualifications? (Consider him in comparison with others in his grade or of about the same length of service.) Indicate by marking X in ink in the appropriate rectangle. A mark below Average will be considered unfavorable.

	Superior.	Above average.	Average.	Below average.	Inferior.
aptitude for the service.					
conduct					
cooperative qualities					
courtesy					
devotion to duty					
education					
force					
industry					
initiative					
judgment					
justice					
leadership					
military manner and bearing					
neatness of person and dress					
patience					
physical energy and endurance					
reliability					
self-control					
subordination					

ADDITIONAL FOR COMMANDING OFFICERS.
(For Commanding Officers and heads of departments afloat or ashore and heads of yard divisions.)

	Superior.	Above average.	Average.	Below average.	Inferior.
To what degree does he maintain the following:					
Discipline of subordinates					
Loyalty of subordinates					
Efficiency of personnel (based upon the efforts and results of such efforts of the officer concerned)					
Efficiency of material (based upon the results which the officer concerned has accomplished in keeping up or improving the material under his charge)					

INSTRUCTIONS.
In filling out the adjoining columns the reporting officer should be guided by the following definitions:
Above the great majority Superior.
Above the majority Above average.
Equal to the majority Average.
Below the majority Below average.
Below the great majority Inferior.

The qualities and the performance of duty of the officer being reported on should be considered in comparison with similar characteristics of all other officers of the same grade and of about the same length of service of whom the reporting officer has knowledge.

* In accordance with reporting officer's personal opinion, without reference to Medical Officer.

11. Considering the possible requirements of the service in peace or war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command.
Would you—(1) Especially desire to have him? (2) Be satisfied to have him? (3) Prefer not to have him?
(Answer one question only. If "Yes" under (3), the report will be considered unfavorable.)

12. Has he any weaknesses—mental, moral, physical, etc.—which adversely affect his efficiency? (If "Yes," give details.)

[over]

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION BY ORDER OF
THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Appendix D (con't)

17. What was character of inspection report on ship or department on last official inspection? (Quote extracts at available.)

REMARKS.

18. Give any information which might be of value to the Department in making assignments to duty or selections for special duty; also any special information of value to the Selection Board or Examining Board in determining this officer's fitness for promotion. Include a general outline of this officer's character and service as indicated above under special headings.

THIS SPACE MUST NOT BE LEFT BLANK.

(See Art. 117 (7), U. S. N. R., 1930.)

"It is, by no means, enough that an officer of the Navy should be a capable man. He must be that, of course, but also a great deal more. He should be, as well, a gentleman of liberal education, refined in manner, punctilious in strategy, and the nicest sense of personal honor. He should not only be able to express himself clearly and with force in his own language both with tongue and pen, but he should be versed in French and Spanish. * * * He should be the soul of tact, patience, justice, firmness, and charity. No subordinate, not of a subordinate should escape his attention or be left to pass without its reward, if even the reward be only one word of approval. Conversely, he should not be kind to a single fault in any subordinate, though at the same time he should be quick and unflinching to distinguish error from failure, thoughtlessness from inconsiderateness, and well-meant shortcomings from heedless or stupid blunder. As he should be universal and impartial in his awards and approval of merit, so should he be judicial and unbending in his punishment or reproof of misconduct. * * * [John Paul Jones to the Marine Committee, September 11, 1775.]

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.

Assign marks on the scale of 4.0 to all officers under 1, 2 (a), and 3, when appropriate, and on the subjects describing present duty. Give marks in other subjects in which he appears qualified for a mark of 3 or more. Indicate the duty or duties in which he is at his best, or is most capable of being developed, by placing "R" after the appropriate mark. In no case give a mark of over 3.5 unless he is capable of performing duty of the character named of the first order of importance, commensurate with his grade.

1. Command
2. (a) Executive Officer or executive ability
3. (a) Seamanship
4. (a) Strategy and tactics
- (b) Law
- (c) International law
- (d) Diplomacy
5. (a) General board
- (b) War college
6. Administration: (a) Fleet
- (b) Navy Department
- (c) Office or Bureau
- (d) Navy Yard
- (e) Office or Division
- (f) Flag aid
7. (a) Navigator
- (b) Surveying
8. (a) Fire control
9. (a) Gunnery officer
- (b) Battery officer
10. (a) Torpedo officer
- (b) Mining
- (c) Design
- (d) Inspection
11. (a) Explosives and magazines
- (b) Experimental and design
- (c) Inspection
- (d) Armor and projectiles
12. (a) Engineering, reciprocating
- (b) Design
- (c) Inspection
13. (a) Engineering, turbines
- (b) Design
- (c) Inspection
14. (a) Engineering, internal combustion
- (b) Design
- (c) Inspection
15. (a) Engineering, electrical
- (b) Radiotelegraphy
16. (a) Watch officer
- (b) Division officer
- (c) Morale officer
17. Supply Corps: (a) General storekeeper
- (b) Purchasing pay officer
- (c) Commissary officer
- (d) Pay officer (ship or station)
18. Communication officer: (a) Radio
- (b) Signal
- (c) Coding
19. Recruiting
20. Submarine officer
21. Aviation: (a) Pilot
- (b) Repair
- (c) Engineer
- (d) Aerology
- (e) Administration
- (f) Observer
22. Medical Corps: (a) Medicine
- (b) Surgery
- (c) Sanitation
- (d) Dietetics
- (e) X-ray
- (f) Eye, ear, nose, and throat
- (g) Genito-urinary
- (h) Dentistry
23. Civil engineer: (a) Public works
- (b) Design
24. Naval Academy
25. Professor of mathematics
26. Interpreter: (a) Spanish
- (b) French
- (c) German
- (d) Japanese
- (e) Italian
- (f) Russian
27. Naval attaché
28. Naval constructor: (a) Construction
- (b) Design
29. Intelligence duty
30. Any duty not listed
31. Do you recommend him for special training or study?
- Is he an applicant?
- Is he willing?

(1900) 10 10 10 10 10

ORIGINAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION OR OTHER USE
THE CASE OF REV. J. W. BROWN

APPENDIX E

N. Nav. 413
(July, 1929)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

(To be submitted in accordance with Section 5 of Chapter 2, U. S. Navy Regulations, 1920)

Report to be typewritten, except that question 12 need not be

The following four questions to be made out by the officer reported on:

....., Rank, U. S. N.
(Sign one first)

Ship or Station Period from to

1. Regular and additional duties
2. Usual residence (home)
(Authority for a change in usual residence must be secured from the Bureau of Navigation; an address reported on this form will not constitute such a change. See Art. 155 (2), U. S. N. R., 1920.)
3. Proficiency in foreign languages, stating which ones, and ability therein
4. My preference for next duty is:
(a) Sea Fleet
(b) Shore Location

Following to be made out by Reporting Officer:

(Signature)

5. Reporting Officer: Name, Rank, U. S. N.
6. Reporting Officer's official status relative to officer reported on
7. Employment of ship during period of this report
8. Assign marks on scale of 0-4 in "Executive Ability" and on duties performed during the period of this report; also, assign marks on other professional qualifications on which observation has been sufficient to justify marking. (Duties and qualifications to be listed, followed by assigned marks—a mark of 2.0 or less must be referred to the officer reported upon.)

Executive Ability
9. Has the work of this officer been reported on either in a commendatory way or adversely during the period of this report? If so, state the substance of the report.
.....
.....
.....
10. Considering the possible requirements of the service in peace or war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command. Would you—(1) Especially desire to have him? (2) Be satisfied to have him? (3) Prefer not to have him?
11. Has he any weaknesses—mental, moral, physical, etc.—which adversely affect his efficiency? (If "Yes," give details.)
.....
.....
.....

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1900
LIBRARY OF THE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Appendix E (con't)

12 To what degree has he exhibited the following qualifications? (Each line is checked into four main divisions, with a definition below each division. Under only the definition below each line which most closely fits in regard to the subject. Having decided which definition is most suitable, place a check mark at the grading along line to which the person being marked is entitled. A check to the right of the division which is not checked is an unsatisfactory (unfavorable) report.)

Intelligence (With reference to the facts and circumstances involved in action.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Judgment (With reference to a definite situation in regard to which the subject is called upon to make a decision.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Initiative (With reference to the subject's ability to take the initiative and to make decisions in the absence of orders.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Force (With reference to mental power and energy.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Leadership (With reference to the subject's ability to lead and to inspire others.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Tact (With reference to the subject's ability to handle delicate situations.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Cooperation (With reference to the subject's ability to work with others.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Loyalty (With reference to the subject's devotion to duty.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Attention to Duty (With reference to the subject's ability to perform his duty.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Precision of Mind (With reference to the subject's ability to think clearly.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Endurance (With reference to the subject's ability to stand up to fatigue and strain.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Industry (With reference to the subject's ability to work hard.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Military Bearing (With reference to the subject's military appearance and conduct.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Neatness of Person and Dress (With reference to the subject's personal appearance.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well
Attitude for Service (With reference to the subject's attitude toward his duty.)	1. Not at all	2. Somewhat	3. Fairly	4. Well

REMARKS

13 Give in this space (a) A brief and concise statement of this officer's personal and military character, his fitness for promotion, (b) any other pertinent facts of special mention, (c) any other information which might be of value to the department in making assignments to duty.

THIS SPACE MUST NOT BE LEFT BLANK

Use No. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

APPENDIX F

N. Nav. 645-A
Sept., 1930

(TO BE USED ONLY FOR OFFICERS ON SHORE DUTY)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

(To be submitted in accordance with Section 5 of Chapter 2, U. S. Navy Regulations, 1920)

The following four questions to be made out by the officer reported on:

....., Rank, U. S. N.
(Surname first)

Station Period from to

1. Regular and additional duties
2. Usual residence (home)
(Authority for a change in usual residence must be secured from the Bureau of Navigation; an address reported on this form will not constitute such a change. See Art. 135 (2), U. S. N. R., 1920.)
3. Proficiency in foreign languages, stating which ones, and ability therein
4. My preference for next duty is:
(a) Sea Fleet
(b) Shore Location

Following to be made out by Reporting Officer:

5. Reporting Officer: Name, Rank, U. S. N.

6. Reporting Officer's official status relative to officer reported on

8. Assign marks on scale of 0-4 in "Executive Ability" and on duties performed during the period of this report; also, assign marks on other professional qualifications on which observation has been sufficient to justify marking. (Duties and qualifications to be listed, followed by assigned marks—a mark of 2.0 or less must be referred to the officer reported upon.)

Executive Ability

9. Has the work of this officer been reported on either in a commendatory way or adversely during the period of this report? If so, state the substance of the report.

10. Considering the possible requirements of the service in peace or war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command. Would you—(1) Especially desire to have him? (2) Be satisfied to have him? (3) Prefer not to have him?

11. Has he any weaknesses—mental, moral, physical, etc.—which adversely affect his efficiency? (If "Yes," give details.)

REPRODUCED FROM
THE PHOTOGRAPH
OF THE
ORIGINAL IN THE
POSSESSION OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Appendix F (con't)

12. To what degree has he exhibited the following qualifications? (Each line is divided into four main divisions, with a definition below each division. Consider only the definition below each line which accurately fits in regard to the subject. Having decided which definition is most suitable, place a check mark at the grading along line to which the person being marked is entitled. The grading in each main division commences at the right and increases in favorableness to the left. A check to the right of the double vertical line will be considered as an unsatisfactory (unfavorable) report.)

Intelligence (With reference to the faculty of comprehension; mental acumen.)	Extraordinarily quick; understands quickly.	Understands quickly.	Readily understands mental situations and conditions.	Shows comprehension; intelligent.
Judgment (With reference to the ability of making proper decisions; the ability to make proper decisions.)	Usually acts in rational, well-considered decisions.	Can generally be depended on to make proper decisions.	Good judgment in normal and routine things.	Good judgment; draws sound conclusions.
Initiative (With reference to the ability of originating thinking and action; the ability to originate and execute ideas on one's own responsibility.)	Exceptional in ability to think, plan, and execute without waiting to be told and instructed.	Able to plan and execute independently on his own responsibility.	Capable of performing normal and routine duties on own responsibility.	Shows constant good sense and originality in his work; exercises responsibility.
Pulse (With reference to moral power; courage and energy in producing results.)	Strong, dynamic.	Strong.	Efficient under normal and routine circumstances.	Works with his subordinates.
Leadership (With reference to the faculty of directing, controlling, and influencing others in definite lines of action.)	Inspires others to a high degree by personal example; will always have a following.	A very good leader; attracts subordinates.	Looks well, but has his limitations.	A good leader of men; fails to attract others; does not inspire confidence.
Tact (With reference to the faculty of being courteous, considerate, and amiable in dealing with others.)	Adaptable and courteous to a high degree; has been tried upon to handle delicate questions of all nature.	Adaptable, courteous, and successful in dealing with others.	Reasonably tactful.	Irritable; creates friction.
Cooperation (With reference to the faculty of working harmoniously with others toward the accomplishment of common duties.)	Exceptionally cooperative in working with others to a common end.	Works in harmony with others.	Responsive to leadership.	Obstructive.
Loyalty (Fidelity, faithfulness, ability, confidence, and with reference to a cause and to higher authority.)	Unswerving in allegiance; frank and honest in advising and advising.	A high sense of loyalty.	Faithful in the execution of his duty.	Hypocritical; disloyal.
Attention to Duty (With reference to the faculty of carrying on all work in a thorough and conscientious manner.)	Has an exceptionally high standard with reference to devotion to duty.	Attends to his duty in a highly satisfactory manner.	Satisfactory attention to duty.	Incited to desert or neglect his work.
Precision of Mind (With reference to the faculty of acting intelligently in a logical manner in difficult and unbusiness situations.)	Exceptionally cool-headed and logical in his actions under all conditions.	Composed and logical in his actions in difficult situations.	Logical in his actions in general.	Easily discouraged.
Endurance (With reference to ability in carrying on under any and all conditions.)	Capable of standing an exceptional amount of physical hardships and strain.	Can perform well his duties under trying conditions.	Of normal endurance.	Tired or breaks down easily.
Industry (With reference to performance of duties in an energetic manner.)	Extremely energetic and industrious.	Thorough and energetic.	Intermittently energetic and industrious.	Indolent; inactive; lazy.
Military Bearing (With reference to military carriage and dignity of demeanor.)	Exceptional in carriage.	Carries himself well.	Bearing fair.	Unmilitary in bearing.
Neatness of Person and Dress (With reference to correctness of uniform and smartness of appearance.)	Punctilious as to neatness; immaculate in dress and person.	Properly and well dressed and careful of personal appearance.	Generally neat and correct in uniform.	Untidy in dress or personal appearance.
Attitude for Service (With reference to a natural capacity and general fitness for the Naval Service.)	Enthusiastic and well fitted for the Naval Service.	Well fitted and interested.	Adaptable and giving in nature; of the able officer, suitable for the Naval Service.	Not fitted.

REMARKS

13. Give in this space a clear and concise estimate of this officer's personal and military character, his fitness for promotion, any duty performed worthy of special mention and any information which might be of value to the department in making assignments to duty.

THIS SPACE MUST NOT BE LEFT BLANK
(See Art. 127 (7), U. S. N. R., 1900)

6-200

(Do not write in marked portion of this space)

(Do not write in marked portion of this space)

(Signature)

6-200

X

THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN
48106-1000

APPENDIX G

NAVPERS 310 (Rev. 8-43)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

(To be submitted in accordance with Section 5 of Chapter 2, U. S. Navy Regulations, 1920, and Bureau of Naval Personnel Manual, Article C-1006)

(Before making out this report read latest Bureau of Naval Personnel circular letter on the subject of fitness reports)

The following four questions to be made out by the officer reported on:

File No.

Ship or Station Rank U. S. N.
(Surname first)
Period from to
(Ship aviation units enter ship to which attached)

1. Regular duties

Additional duties
(State watch duties, both deck and engineering. After each duty insert in parenthesis number of months this reporting period)

2. Present address of { wife (if married)
next of kin (if unmarried)

(Indicate above the best address at which the Bureau of Naval Personnel may communicate with the wife or next of kin in an emergency. The above address does not relate to the usual residence (home) which is maintained in the Bureau. See Art. 135(2), U. S. N. R., 1920.)

3. Proficiency in foreign languages, stating which ones, and ability therein

4. My preference for next duty is—

(a) Sea Fleet

(b) Shore Location

(Signature)

Following to be made out by Reporting Officer:

5. Reporting Officer: Name Rank U. S. N.

6. Reporting officer's official status relative to officer reported on

7. Employment of ship during period of this report

8. Assign marks on scale of 0-4 in appropriate subdivisions given below, and any other qualification on which observation has been sufficient to justify marking.

(Staff officers to be marked with respect to required duties. Mark below 2.5 constitutes an unsatisfactory report)

Present assignment Ability to command As executive or division officer As deck watch officer

In administration Ship handling

9. Has the work of this officer been reported on either in a commendatory way or adversely during the period of this report? If so, state the subject, reference numbers, and substance of report. Clip copy to report. Comply with U. S. Navy Regulations, article 137 (11) with respect to commendatory reports. Any adverse comment constitutes an unsatisfactory report.

10. Considering the possible requirements in war, indicate your attitude toward having this officer under your command. Would you—
(An affirmative entry in item (4) constitutes an unsatisfactory report)

(1) Particularly desire to have him? (2) Be pleased to have him? (3) Be satisfied to have him?

(4) Prefer not to have him?

11. Has he any weaknesses—ment., moral, physical, etc.—which adversely affect his efficiency? (If "Yes," give details.)
(An implied or stated defect constitutes an unsatisfactory report)

ORIGINAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
REPRODUCTION BY OTHERS
THE CARE OF THE LIBRARY

Appendix G (con't)

12. To what degree has he exhibited the following qualities? (See instructions in latest Bureau of Naval Personnel circular letter on the subject of fitness reports.)

	Exceptionally quick-witted; keen in understanding.	Grasps essentials of a situation quickly.	Understands normal situations and conditions.	Slow of comprehension; unimaginative.
Intelligence (With reference to the faculty of comprehension; mental acuteness.)				
Judgment (With reference to a discriminating perception by which the values and relations of things are mentally ascertained.)	Usually keen in estimating situations and reaching sound decisions.	Can generally be depended on to make proper decisions.	Fair judgment in normal and routine things.	Frequently draws wrong conclusions.
Initiative (With reference to constructive thinking and resourcefulness; ability and intelligence to act on own responsibility.)	Excellent in ability to think, plan, and do things without waiting to be told and instructed.	Able to plan and execute missions on his own responsibility.	Capable of performing routine duties on own responsibility.	Requires constant guidance and supervision in his work, or evades responsibilities.
Force (With reference to moral power possessed and exerted in producing results.)	Strong, dynamic.	Strong.	Effectual under normal and routine circumstances.	Less than normal.
Leadership (With reference to the faculty of directing, controlling, and influencing others in definite lines of action.)	Inspires others to a high degree by precept and example.	A very good leader.	Leads fairly well.	A poor leader.
Moral Courage (With reference to that mental quality which impels one to carry out the dictates of his conscience and convictions fearlessly.)	Exceptionally courageous.	Courageous to a high degree.	Fairly courageous.	Timid.
Cooperation (With reference to the faculty of working harmoniously with others toward the accomplishment of common duties.)	Exceptionally successful in working with others to a common end.	Works in harmony with others.	Cooperates fairly well.	Not cooperative.
Loyalty (Fidelity, faithfulness, allegiance, constancy — all with reference to a cause and to higher authority.)	Unswerving in allegiance; frank and honest in advice and advising.	A high sense of loyalty.	Reasonably faithful in the execution of his duty.	Inclined to be disloyal.
Perseverance (With reference to maintenance of purpose or undertaking in spite of obstacles or discouragement.)	Determined, resolute.	Constant in purpose.	Fairly steady.	Inclined to vacillate.
Reactions in emergencies (With reference to the faculty of acting instinctively in a logical manner in difficult and unforeseen situations.)	Exceptionally cool-headed and logical in his actions under all conditions.	Composed and logical in his actions in difficult situations.	Fairly logical in his actions in general.	Inclined to be disconcerted.
Endurance (With reference to ability for carrying on under any and all conditions.)	Capable of standing an exceptional amount of physical hardship and strain.	Can perform well his duties under trying conditions.	Of normal endurance.	Less than normal.
Industry (With reference to performance of duties in an energetic manner.)	Extremely energetic and industrious.	Thorough and energetic.	Reasonably energetic and industrious.	Indolent; lazy.
Military bearing and neatness of person and dress (With reference to dignity of demeanor, correctness of uniform, and smartness of appearance.)	Exceptional.	Very good.	Fair.	Unmilitary and untidy.

A CHECK TO RIGHT OF THIS LINE CONSTITUTES AN UNSATISFACTORY REPORT

13. In comparison with other officers of his rank and approximate length of service, how would you designate this officer? Outstanding Excellent Above average Average Below average

REMARKS

14. Is this officer professionally qualified to perform ALL the duties of his grade? Yes _____ No _____ If deficient in any particular, comment is required. Give in this space a clear, concise estimate of this officer's personal and military character, his fitness for promotion, and duty performed worthy of special mention, and any information which might be of value to the Department in making assignments to duty. A check opposite "No," except for inexperienced Ensigns, or a statement that performance of duty is clearly unsatisfactory constitutes an unsatisfactory report. A statement of minor deficiencies either in character or performance of duties constitutes an unfavorable report. (THIS SPACE IS NOT TO BE LEFT BLANK.)

15. An unsatisfactory report must have statement of officer reported on attached; an unfavorable report requires that officer reported on has been informed of his deficiencies either verbally or in writing. Has this been done? _____ What improvement, if any, has been noted? _____

(Signature)

16-52045-2

(Do not write in unruled portion of this space)

THE STATE OF NEW YORK
IN SENATE
JANUARY 22, 1911
SARAH A. PHOTOGRAPH

APPENDIX H

OFFICER'S FITNESS REPORT INSTRUCTION SHEET

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS—READ CAREFULLY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The attached revised Officer's Fitness Report is to be used in place of the old forms, NAVPERS 310 and 311.

This form serves the following purposes:

1. It serves as a report of fitness for all officers both afloat and on shore.
2. The first carbon—(Page 2)—keeps up to date in BuPers the Officer's Qualifications Questionnaire, which provides the Bureau with information covering each officer's previous experience and qualifications for various types of duty.
3. The second carbon—(Page 3)—provides data covering changes in the officer's qualifications and is to be filed in the Officer's Qualification Record Jacket as an aid to Commanding Officers and Personnel Officers in assigning him properly.

This form is to be submitted semi-annually for all officers and in all cases of permanent detachment of either the officer or reporting senior. Special reports of fitness on an officer, on the prescribed form, shall be made whenever the officer reported on:

- (a) Distinguishes himself in battle.
- (b) Performs an outstanding act of valor or devotion to duty.
- (c) Displays extraordinary courage, ability, or resource in time of peril or great responsibility.
- (d) Is guilty of serious misconduct or marked inefficiency.

A typewriter is to be used when at all possible in filling out Sections 1 through 6. Since 96% of all fitness reports received in BuPers are typed, the form has been constructed for that type of preparation. Care should be exercised that the carbon copies are legible if a typewriter is not used.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING OFFICERS

In deciding on promotions of officers, Selection Boards must, in effect, compare an officer with others of the same rank rather than with more arbitrary standards. You will note that in Section 7 and subsequent sections you are asked to do just that—compare each officer with all others of the same rank and corps whose professional abilities are known to you personally. Please note that the officer is not to be compared only with the others of his rank now under your command. For this reason, it is important to indicate in Section 9b how many officers are included in the group you use for comparison.

In making this comparison, keep in mind that the group of officers whose professional abilities are known to you personally (or any other group of people) will fall into a normal distribution when graded on any trait or factor—that is, there will be a small number at the lower end, a larger group in the middle, and a small group at the top. With this curve in mind, compare the officer with the group and mark him on each factor

in Section 7 as falling in one of the five brackets—the 10%, the next 20%, the middle 40%, the next 20% or the 10%. Do not hesitate to mark "not observed" on any factor which you think not applicable to the duty in which you observed the officer or in which your observation has been limited to warrant judgment.

No entry which is made in Section 7 will be considered an unsatisfactory report. Only adverse comment in Section 6 entries so designated in Sections 8, 9, 11, and 12 will be considered.

An unsatisfactory report must be referred to the officer reported on for his statement which is to be attached to the report of fitness. In any case open to question as to what constitute entry of an unfavorable or unsatisfactory nature the officer always be given the benefit of having seen the report. (Articles 1701 and 1405 Navy Regulations, and BuPers Manual Article B-2202.

The Bureau desires that reporting seniors make every effort to show each fitness report to the officer reported upon and discuss it with him, in so far as practicable. In this connection please note the instructions in Section 12 which provide statements of a constructive nature which refer to minor imperfections or lack of qualifications do not constitute an unsatisfactory report. On every report of fitness, the reporting senior will indicate under Section 12 whether the officer reported on has or has not seen the report.

The reporting senior will sign all three pages of the report in the lower right hand corner, or will sign the original and designate a commissioned officer, preferably senior to the officer reported on, to authenticate Pages 2 and 3 in lower right hand corner. The officer reported on may sign and retain Page 3 inserting same in his qualification jacket, if he is geographic detached from the reporting senior.

The Officer's Fitness Report (Page 1) and the Officer's Qualification Report—BuPers Copy—(Page 2) are to be forwarded—not separated—to BuPers. The Officer's Qualification Report—Jacket Copy—(Page 3) is to be detached and filed in the Officer's Qualification Record Jacket.

Fitness Reports are to be submitted promptly and their preparation is one of the most important and responsible duties of superior officers. Failure to prepare them objectively is detrimental to the efficiency of the Navy. If not submitted promptly, the rights of the officer reported on may be prejudiced. The fitness of an officer for the service with respect to promotion and assignment to duty is determined by his record.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR OFFICER REPORTED ON

It is your responsibility to fill out Sections 1 through 5 of the form and to sign all sheets in the lower left hand corner. Submit the form to your reporting senior at the times specified in the General Instructions above. Use a typewriter, if at all possible—if not, use ink, but be sure that all copies are legible.

NOTE: For convenience there is printed on the back of these instructions a work sheet which may be used as a draft in preparing the carbonized set. The work sheet is to be detached before filling out the carbonized set and is NOT to be forwarded to BuPers.

THE STATE OF NEW YORK
IN SENATE
JANUARY 1871
REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Appendix H (con't)

NAVPERS-310A (Rev. 6-45)

OFFICER'S FITNESS REPORT WORK SHEET

READ CAREFULLY THE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE SIDE

[illegible]

OFFICIAL PRESCRIPTION
NO. 11 10 100 100
PRESCRIPTION BY JAMES W.
DR. JAMES W. JAMES

APPENDIX I

NAVPERS-310 (Rev. 3-51)

REPORT ON THE FITNESS OF OFFICERS

Date submitted

THE OFFICER REPORTED ON WILL FILL IN THE FIRST FIVE SECTIONS:

1. NAME	(Last)	(First)	(Middle)	Grade	USN (R)	Designator	File No.
2. SHIP OR STATION				DATE REPORTED PRESENT DUTY STATION			
3. PERIOD OF REPORT		OCCASION FOR REPORT		TYPE OF REPORT			
FROM	TO	Semi-annual	Detachment of Reporting Senior	Detachment of Officer	Regular	Concurrent	Special
4. IRREGULAR AND ADDITIONAL DUTIES. List all duties assigned, including watches. List courses of study or instruction carried on. After each item insert in parentheses number of months this reporting period.							
5. PROFICIENCY IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, STATING WHICH ONES AND ABILITY THEREIN							
(Signature of officer reported on)							

FOLLOWING TO BE FILLED IN BY THE REPORTING OFFICER:

6. EMPLOYMENT OF COMMAND DURING PERIOD OF THIS REPORT			
7. REFERENCE HERE AND APPEND COPY OF ANY COMMENDABLE OR ADVERSE REPORTS ON THIS OFFICER RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD OF THIS REPORT			
8. PERFORMANCE. Assign marks on a scale of 0 to 4.0 on the appropriate qualifications listed, and on any other significant qualification, on which observation has been sufficient to justify marking. "PRESENT ASSIGNMENT" must always be marked where any other marks or comments relative to performance are made. A mark below 2.5 constitutes an adverse entry.			
PRESENT ASSIGNMENT	ABILITY TO COMMAND	AS STAFF OFFICER	
AS EXECUTIVE OR DIVISION OFFICER	(Type watch)	IN ADMINISTRATION	
SHIP HANDLING	TECHNICAL COMPETENCE	IN (State specialty)	
9. CONSIDERING THE POSSIBLE REQUIREMENTS OF WAR, INDICATE YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD HAVING THIS OFFICER UNDER YOUR COMMAND. WOULD YOU			
PARTICULARLY DESIRE TO HAVE HIM?	BE PLEASED TO HAVE HIM?	BE SATISFIED TO HAVE HIM?	PREFER NOT TO HAVE HIM? (Adverse)
10. IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER OFFICERS OF HIS GRADE AND APPROXIMATE LENGTH OF SERVICE, HOW WOULD YOU DESIGNATE THIS OFFICER?			
OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	ABOVE AVERAGE	AVERAGE
BELOW AVERAGE			
11. COMMENTS. Give in this space a concise appraisal of the officer reported on. Comment on his fitness for promotion and on any outstanding characteristics of value to the naval service, including superior ability to command and outstanding qualifications in any field such as administration, planning, logistics, electronics, new weapons, or new developments. Comment on observed skill in dealing with the public in personal or official contacts. Any mental, moral, or physical weaknesses which might affect his efficiency, or failure to meet qualifications normally expected of an officer of his grade and designation should be indicated. Any adverse entry made in any part of the report must be explained in this paragraph. This space must not be left blank.			
12. NAME, GRADE, AND FILE NUMBER OF REPORTING OFFICER. OFFICIAL STATUS RELATIVE TO OFFICER REPORTED ON.			

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

Appendix I (con't)

13. TO WHAT DEGREE HAS THE OFFICER REPORTED ON EXHIBITED THE FOLLOWING QUALITIES?

	NOT OBSERVED	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	AVERAGE	UNSATIS- FACTORY
(a) INTELLIGENCE (With reference to the faculty of comprehension; mental acuteness.)		Exceptionally quick-witted; keen in understanding.	Grasps essentials of a situation quickly.	Understands normal situations and conditions.	A MARK TO THE RIGHT OF THIS LINE CONSTITUTES AN ADVERSE REPORT
(b) JUDGMENT (With reference to a discriminating perception by which the values and relations of things are mentally ascertained.)		Unusually keen in estimating situations and reaching sound decisions.	Can generally be depended on to make proper decisions.	Fair judgment in normal and routine things.	
(c) INITIATIVE (With reference to constructive thinking and resourcefulness; ability and intelligence to act on own responsibility.)		Exceptional in ability to think, plan, and do things without waiting to be told and instructed.	Able to plan and execute missions on his own responsibility.	Capable of performing routine duties on own responsibility.	
(d) FORCE (With reference to moral power possessed and exerted in producing results.)		Strong, dynamic.	Strong.	Effectual under normal and routine circumstances.	
(e) LEADERSHIP (With reference to the faculty of directing, controlling, and influencing others in definite lines of action and of maintaining discipline.)		Inspires others to a high degree by precept and example. Requires a high standard of discipline.	A very good leader.	Leads fairly well.	
(f) MORAL COURAGE (With reference to that mental quality which impels one to carry out the dictates of his conscience and convictions fearlessly.)		Exceptionally courageous.	Courageous to a high degree.	Fairly courageous.	
(g) COOPERATION (With reference to the faculty of working harmoniously with others toward the accomplishment of common duties.)		Exceptionally successful in working with others to a common end.	Works in harmony with others.	Cooperates fairly well.	
(h) LOYALTY (Fidelity, faithfulness, allegiance, constancy—all with reference to a cause and to higher authority.)		Unswerving in allegiance; frank and honest in aiding and advising.	A high sense of loyalty.	Reasonably faithful in the execution of his duty.	
(i) PERSEVERANCE (With reference to maintenance of purpose or undertaking in spite of obstacles or discouragement.)		Determined, resolute.	Constant in purpose.	Fairly steady.	
(j) REACTION IN EMERGENCIES (With reference to the faculty of acting instinctively in a logical manner in difficult and unforeseen situations.)		Exceptionally cool-headed and logical in his actions under all conditions.	Composed and logical in his actions in difficult situations.	Fairly logical in his actions in general.	
(k) ENDURANCE (With reference to ability for carrying on under any and all conditions.)		Capable of standing an exceptional amount of physical hardship and strain.	Can perform well his duties under trying conditions.	Of normal endurance.	
(l) INDUSTRY (With reference to performance of duties in an energetic manner.)		Extremely energetic and industrious.	Thorough and energetic.	Reasonably energetic and industrious.	
(m) MILITARY BEARING AND NEATNESS OF PERSON AND DRESS (With reference to dignity of demeanor, correctness of uniform, and smartness of appearance.)		Exceptional.	Very good.	Fair.	

14. A report containing adverse matter must be referred to the officer reported on for statement pursuant to article 1701 (9) USNR. His statement should be attached to this report. Statements of minor deficiencies either in character or performance of duties must be brought to the attention of the officer reported on either orally or in writing.

HAS THIS BEEN DONE? _____ WHAT IMPROVEMENT, IF ANY, HAS BEEN NOTED? _____

THE CASE OF THE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION
AND THE
OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

APPENDIX J

NAVMC 652-PD
(Revised 7-50)

OFFICER FITNESS REPORT U. S. MARINE CORPS

SECTION A (To be completed by adjutant or unit personnel officer)

1. _____ USMC _____
(Last name) (First name) (Initial) (Grade) (Service number)
2. Organization _____
3. Primary MOS _____ Additional MOS's _____
4. Occasion for report (check appropriate box):
☐ Annual ☐ Detachment of officer reported on ☐ Change of reporting senior ☐ Concurrent report ☐ Special (Explain on line below)

5. Period covered: From _____ to _____ Months _____
6. Periods of nonavailability (30 days or more) (Explain) _____

7. Duty assignments during period covered: Regular (Dates, descriptive title, and duty MOS) _____

 Additional (Descriptive title and number of months) _____

8. Officer's preference for next assignment (1st choice) _____
 (2d choice) _____ (3d choice) _____
9. Name of reporting senior _____ Grade _____ US _____
10. Duty assignment _____

SECTION B (To be completed by reporting senior)

11. Recommendations for officer's next duty assignment:

12. During the period covered by this report:

	Yes	No	
(a) Has the work of this officer been reported on in a commendatory way?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If Yes in (a), (b), or (c), and a report has NOT been submitted to the CMC, attach separate statement of nature and attendant circumstances. If a report has been submitted to the CMC, reference such report below:
(b) Has the work of this officer been reported adversely?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(c) Was he the subject of any disciplinary action that should be included on his record?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
13. Entries on this report are based on (Check appropriate box):
☐ Daily contact and close observation of his work ☐ Frequent observations of his work ☐ Infrequent observations of his work

14. Remarks:

16-62236-1

Appendix J (con't)

SECTION C (To be completed by reporting senior)

DIRECTIONS

1. This section contains 27 elements on which the officer is to be rated. For each element five levels of performance are defined by examples. The examples do not cover every possible type of behavior for the element to be rated, but are typical examples of performance at the various levels.
2. Read and consider all five levels of performance which are defined for each element. Determine which level most properly describes the officer, and record an "X" in the box above the selected example. Mark the "unknown" box whenever you have insufficient information to make an evaluation.
3. Follow this procedure until you have recorded a mark for each of the 27 elements.

I. PROFICIENCY IN HANDLING ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

1. UNDERSTANDING INSTRUCTIONS:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Misunderstands instructions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is slow to grasp instructions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Understands instructions with a minimum of elaboration.	<input type="checkbox"/> Grasps quickly the main points of instructions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Grasps instructions quickly, completely, and accurately.
2. SCHEDULING WORK:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedules work so poorly that the activities of others are hindered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes ineffective allocations of time and effort.	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedules work so as to cover the important phases of assignments.	<input type="checkbox"/> Schedules work so well that all phases of assignments are covered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Distributes time and effort so that all phases of assignments are covered in a particularly efficient manner.
3. CHECKING ACCURACY OF WORK:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks numerous serious errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks serious errors occasionally.	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks only minor errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks only a few minor errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks no errors.
4. WRITING LETTERS AND REPORTS:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequently writes unacceptable letters or reports.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writes acceptable letters or reports only after receiving suggestions for extensive revision.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writes acceptable letters or reports.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writes letters or reports which are clear and well expressed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writes superior letters or reports on difficult subjects.
5. GETTING COOPERATION:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Antagonizes many of those whose support is essential.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes little attempt to get cooperation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Enlists cooperation in important phases of his work from those concerned.	<input type="checkbox"/> Enlists cooperation in all phases of his work by dealing tactfully with those concerned.	<input type="checkbox"/> Gets the full and active support of all concerned through his tactful and persuasive manner.
6. PRESENTING FINISHED WORK:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents work in such disorganized form that it gives almost no basis for action.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents work in such form that it gives incomplete basis for action.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents work in such form that action can be taken.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents work in such form that necessary action is clearly indicated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents work so organized that action can be taken quickly and with confidence.

II. PROFICIENCY IN SUPERVISING PERSONNEL

7. DELEGATING AUTHORITY:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Hesitates to delegate necessary authority.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes overlapping or vague delegation of authority.	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegates authority to obtain adequate efficiency.	<input type="checkbox"/> Delegates authority so well that efficiency is assured.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes clear-cut delegations of authority resulting in maximum efficiency.
8. GIVING ORDERS AND INSTRUCTIONS:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Creates resentment by the arbitrary manner in which he gives orders.	<input type="checkbox"/> Obtains submission to orders by his reliance on authority alone.	<input type="checkbox"/> Obtains compliance without arousing resentment when giving orders.	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieves willing compliance by considering the self-respect of subordinates when giving orders.	<input type="checkbox"/> Inspires enthusiastic cooperation by the use of tact in giving orders.
9. SUPPORTING ACTIONS OF SUBORDINATES:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Disclaims responsibility for subordinates' actions taken under the authority he has delegated to them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not support actions taken under authority that he has delegated to subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Backs up actions taken under specific authority delegated to subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Backs up actions taken under general authority delegated to subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Takes responsibility for subordinates' actions even when subordinates exceed authority delegated to them.
10. DEVELOPING TEAMWORK:					
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Neglects to develop cooperation and teamwork among his subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes little effort to develop cooperation and teamwork among his subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Develops adequate cooperation and teamwork among his subordinates.	<input type="checkbox"/> Develops good teamwork which results in an effective organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> Develops outstanding teamwork which results in maximum effectiveness.

16-62230-1

[illegible] 5. address

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION BY ANY OF
THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENTS

Appendix J (con't)

II. MAINTAINING RELATIONS WITH SUBORDINATES:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Fails to maintain discipline and the respect due an officer in his position because of undue familiarity with subordinates.	Maintains discipline and the respect due an officer in his position with difficulty because of undue familiarity with subordinates.	Maintains friendly relations with subordinates without loss of discipline or the respect due his position.	Associates with subordinates in a manner which insures the respect due him as a superior officer.	Attains a high level of discipline and respect from subordinates through his friendly but dignified conduct toward them.

III. PROFICIENCY IN PLANNING AND DIRECTING ACTION

12. SOLVING PROBLEMS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Fails to solve problems commonly encountered in his work.	Makes inadequate solutions to problems he could reasonably be expected to handle successfully.	Solves day-to-day problems by making use of existing resources.	Solves difficult problems by making adaptations of existing resources.	Solves very unusual problems by ingenious procedures.

13. PREPARING PLANS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Prepares inadequate plans.	Prepares plans based on only obvious factors.	Prepares adequate plans emphasizing the obvious factors.	Prepares thorough plans based on an understanding of all factors.	Prepares highly effective plans based on a thorough analysis of all factors.

14. TAKING PROMPT ACTION:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Fails to act when decisions are needed.	Hesitates or puts off making needed decisions.	Usually takes necessary action with a minimum of delay.	Consistently takes prompt action to meet established needs.	Takes prompt action in unusual or complicated situations.

15. MAKING CORRECT DECISIONS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Frequently makes unsound or questionable decisions.	Occasionally makes questionable decisions.	Usually makes adequate decisions based on reasonable interpretation of facts.	Usually makes good decisions showing sound evaluations of all the factors involved.	Makes excellent decisions which exactly fit all the factors involved.

16. MAKING FORCEFUL EFFORTS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Shows no vigor and force in his efforts to achieve objectives.	Exhibits little vigor and force in his efforts to achieve objectives.	Usually vigorous and forceful in his efforts to achieve objectives.	Pursues objectives of the organization with vigor and force.	Makes extremely vigorous and forceful efforts to achieve objectives.

17. ABSORBING MATERIALS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Delays operations because of slowness in absorbing facts.	Achieves inadequate results because of slow learning.	Learns rapidly enough to do his job in an acceptable manner.	Achieves good results because of capacity to learn involved materials rapidly.	Achieves exceptional results because of his unusual ability to learn.

IV. ACCEPTANCE OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

18. CARRYING OUT ORDERS AND DIRECTIVES:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Frequently delays compliance with orders and directives.	Sometimes delays compliance with orders and directives.	Carries out orders and directives without undue delay.	Carries out orders and directives promptly.	Carries out promptly and effectively the spirit and intent of orders and directives.

19. COOPERATING WITH ASSOCIATES:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Cooperates grudgingly with associates.	Gives assistance to associates when requested to do so.	Cooperates willingly with associates when called upon.	Voluntarily assists associates when help is required.	Is alert to offer assistance to associates when help is needed.

20. ATTENDING TO DUTY:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Requires constant supervision to keep his attention on his assigned duties.	Works just hard enough to get by.	Shows acceptable industry in his work.	Works hard and willingly to achieve objectives.	Does extra work voluntarily in order to achieve objectives.

21. MAINTAINING MILITARY APPEARANCE:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Appearance and bearing interfere with his effectiveness.	Appearance and bearing detract somewhat from his effectiveness.	Presents a good appearance and bearing.	Appearance and bearing create a distinctly favorable impression.	Appearance and bearing inspire a high degree of confidence.

22. CONFORMING TO STANDARDS OF PERSONAL CONDUCT:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Reduces his efficiency or discredits the service by nonconformance to accepted standards of personal conduct.	Does not attain his full efficiency because of occasional laxity in his personal conduct.	Follows accepted standards in his personal conduct.	Maintains high standards in his personal conduct.	Is a distinct credit to the service by maintaining exceptionally high standards of personal conduct.

23. HANDLING PUBLIC RELATIONS:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unknown	Handles public relations in such a manner as to create antagonism.	Overlooks opportunities to further good public relations.	In handling public relations usually creates a favorable impression.	Is alert to opportunities to further good public relations.	Creates opportunities to advance the interests of the service.

16-52297-1

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
PROMOTION OR OTHER BY
THE BUREAU OF BUREAU OF BUREAU

Appendix J (con't)

V. PROFICIENCY IN DUTY ASSIGNMENTS

24. APPLYING TRAINING AND INFORMATION:

<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes serious mistakes in applying fundamentals of his training.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes acceptable application of his training and information only to routine problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes acceptable application of his training and information to most problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes skilled application of his training and information to most problems.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an unusually high degree of skill in applying his training and information to all problems.
----------------------------------	---	---	---	--	---

25. IMPROVING EFFECTIVENESS:

<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Overlooks opportunities offered him to improve his effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes limited effort to improve his effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepts opportunities to improve his effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Is alert to opportunities to improve his effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively seeks out opportunities to improve his effectiveness.
----------------------------------	--	---	--	--	---

26. PROFICIENCY IN REGULAR DUTIES:

<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs inadequately in many phases of his regular duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs adequately in routine phases of his regular duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs adequately in dealing with all problems encountered in his regular duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs excellently in all phases of his regular duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does exceptional work even in the most difficult phases of his regular duties.
----------------------------------	--	---	--	--	---

27. PROFICIENCY IN ADDITIONAL DUTIES:

<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs inadequately in many phases of his additional duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs adequately in routine phases of his additional duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs adequately in dealing with all problems encountered in his additional duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performs excellently in all phases of his additional duties.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does exceptional work even in the most difficult phases of his additional duties.
----------------------------------	---	--	---	---	--

SECTION D (To be used by reporting senior, when appropriate)

Record here any comments necessary to clarify specific ratings made in Section C

SECTION E (To be completed by reporting senior)

I CERTIFY that to the best of my knowledge and belief all entries made hereon are true and without prejudice or partiality.

(Signature of reporting senior)

(Date)

SECTION F (To be completed by officer reported on)

I have seen this completed report:

(Check one) ☐ I have no statement to make.
☐ I have attached a statement.

(Signature of officer reported on)

(Date)

SECTION G (To be completed by reviewing officer)

Name of reviewing officer _____ Grade _____ USMC _____

Duty assignment _____ Initials _____

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION BY ORDER OF
THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

APPENDIX K

CHIEF AND FIRST CLASS PETTY OFFICER EVALUATION SHEET

NAVPERS-1235 (REV. 8-65)

PERIOD OF OBSERVATION COVERED TO	EXPIRATION OF ENLISTMENT		SHIP OR STATION		
ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND INSTRUCTIONS	Cannot seem to follow instructions, no matter how simple.	Understands only simple instructions. Gropes along when in doubt.	Grope main points of most instructions. Hesitates to ask for clarification.	Correctly interprets rather difficult instructions. Asks questions when in doubt.	Understands all instructions, needs no help.
ABILITY TO SOLVE PROBLEMS	Cannot solve problems. Avoids all problems.	Solves simple problems. Stumped by routine problems.	Solves everyday problems rapidly. Solves a few of the more difficult problems.	Solves most problems, and often solves very difficult problems.	Solves any problem rapidly.
ABILITY TO PLAN AND ORGANIZE WORK	Work shows no organization or planning.	Can think of only one job at a time.	With occasional help in planning, work is orderly.	Work is generally well-arranged and usually good planning is shown.	All work is well-planned and organized.
INDUSTRY	Lazy, hides out, "gold bricker", clock watcher.	Often loafs on the job or wastes time, occasionally ducks out or avoids extra work.	Usually on the job, does his share, resents doing other's work.	Does more than his share, works hard, a plugger.	Extremely energetic, tireless, efficiently enthusiastic, full of pep.
RELIABILITY, INCLUDING RESPONSIBILITY	Utterly unreliable, usually in some trouble.	Needs to be watched, often gets out of line.	Means well, but requires guidance.	Steady, usually dependable, conscientious.	Completely reliable, needs no supervision.
BASIC TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE AND BACKGROUND	Requires continued assistance. Entirely over-rated.	Deficiency makes present duties difficult.	Sufficient to perform satisfactorily in his present rate.	More than sufficient for present rate, ready for advancement.	Has more than enough to serve as L. D. O. or W. O.
ABILITY TO APPLY TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE	Never uses what technical knowledge he has.	Often misses a chance to put his technical knowledge into use.	Uses technical knowledge only in routine situations.	Makes good use of general principles in most situations.	Makes maximum use of technical knowledge in all situations.
EFFORT TO INCREASE BOTH KNOWLEDGE AND TECHNICAL ABILITY	Does not care, or try to improve.	Misses many chances to learn.	Accepts but does not seek opportunities to learn.	Alert to any opportunity to improve.	Eager to improve. Always seeking more knowledge.
HUMAN UNDERSTANDING	Just cannot get along with people.	Doesn't understand a lot of his associates, not very well liked.	Gets along with most people.	Understands people, very considerate, and gets along well.	Shows keen understanding of fellow men. Is liked by everyone.
ABILITY TO PROPERLY DELEGATE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY	Never delegates responsibility or authority properly.	Needs assistance in delegating responsibility and authority.	Delegates responsibility and authority with limited effectiveness.	Makes good use of personnel, effectively delegates responsibility and authority.	Always delegates authority and responsibility most effectively.
INITIATIVE	Requires detailed orders and supervision. Shortsighted.	Seldom has an idea. Always looks to supervisor for guidance.	Makes occasional suggestions. Works out own details.	Submits numerous ideas for approval. Acts in an emergency without instructions.	Originates well thought out ideas, goes ahead on his own, exhibits foresight.
TEACHING OR INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY	Borers and confuses everyone.	Occasionally confusing, creates little interest, lacks background.	Generally interesting but unable to simplify complex material.	Interesting, good presentation, well informed.	Creates high interest; presents material very clearly, has thorough knowledge of material.
ABILITY TO BUILD OR MAINTAIN HIGH MORALE	Destroys morale, creates confusion and discontent.	Allows spirit to fall off. Men gripes and disregard his instructions.	Can maintain but seldom raises morale, men follow willingly.	Develops a good "team" feeling, generates enthusiasm.	Inspires highest morale, is an outstanding all-round leader.
EXEMPLARY CONDUCT	Leads others into trouble, a continual disciplinary problem.	Often in trouble, a poor example but not a "ring leader".	Seldom in trouble, minor difficulties only.	Sets a good example, observes regulations, maintains good record.	Sets an excellent example of conduct for all men.
PERSEVERANCE	Readily abandons or evades any but the most simple jobs.	Sticks to a difficult task only under compulsion.	Ordinarily patient and persistent, discouraged by tough problems.	Determined, seldom distracted.	Never gives up, regardless of difficulty or complexity of assignment.
MILITARY APPEARANCE	Sloppy, unkempt, slouches.	Wears uniform improperly, nonregulation, careless posture.	Presents good appearance on scheduled inspections.	Clean cut, neat, good posture.	Wears uniform with great pride, fine military bearing.
NAME (Last)	(First)	(Middle)	RATE AND RATING		SERVICE NO.

10-50853-1

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH

NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION OR FOR
THE USE OF ANY OTHER

Appendix K (con't)

INSTRUCTIONS: Evaluation should not be based upon general impressions; it should be based upon actual, observed performance. The mark given in one trait should not influence the mark given in another trait. Men can be expected to vary in strength from one trait to another. Complete and careful observation should support a mark in each one of the sixteen listed traits.

The following is a step-by-step procedure for using this form:

1. Consider the first trait listed in the left column.
2. Read the descriptive phrases listed to the right of the trait.
3. Decide which of these descriptive phrases best describes the individual.
4. Mark the individual in one of the boxes under the most fitting descriptive phrase.
 - a. These boxes run from the least favorable at the left, to the most favorable at the right.
5. Repeat this same procedure for each of the listed traits, keeping in mind that each trait should be considered separately and that the mark in one trait should not influence the mark in another trait. Also keep in mind that the majority of personnel can be expected to fit into the middle or average category.
6. Now in the space indicated in the lower half of the back page, make a brief comment describing any general impressions you have of the individual; indicate the degree to which you feel the individual is qualified for officer status; indicate your recommendation regarding reenlistment. If this recommendation is negative, include reasons in comments. If the individual has outstanding ability in some technical specialty so state and identify the specialty.

INDICATE OFFICER STATUS <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/> FAIR <input type="checkbox"/> GOOD <input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT <input type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING	BELOW-GRANTED FOR PROMOTION TO <input type="checkbox"/> CPO <input type="checkbox"/> WO <input type="checkbox"/> LDO
--	---

RECOMMENDED FOR REENLISTMENT ☐ YES ☐ NO

RELATION OF REPORTING OFFICER

SIGNATURE, RANK AND FILE NUMBER OF REPORTING OFFICER

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH
NOT TO BE USED FOR
PUBLICATION BY ORDER OF
THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

APPENDIX L

SAMPLE PRECEPT CONVENING A SELECTION BOARD
APPOINTED TO SELECT LINE OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION
TO REAR ADMIRAL

From: The Secretary of the Navy
To: Admiral

Subj: Precept convening a selection board for the re-
 commendation of officers of the line of Navy on
 active duty for temporary promotion to the grade
 of rear admiral

1. A selection board is hereby appointed, consisting of yourself as president and the following additional and alternate members, viz:

.....
Shall act only upon the cases of officers not restricted by law in the performance of duty and officers designated for special duty; shall act only upon the cases of officers designated for engineering duty; and shall act only upon the cases of officers designated for aeronautical engineering duty.

2. will act as recorder.

3. The Board is hereby ordered to convene at the Navy Department, Washington, D. C., on, at ten o'clock a.m., or as soon thereafter as may be practicable.

4. The Chief of Naval Personnel, acting for the Secretary of the Navy, shall furnish the board with the names and records of all line officers eligible for consideration for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral; and with the names of all eligible officers not restricted by law in the performance of duty who are in the promotion zone in the grade under consideration for temporary promotion.

5. From among those officers not restricted by law in the performance of duty who are eligible for consideration for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, the board may recommend officers. Officers holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy who are recommended for

APPENDIX I

COMMITTEE CONCERNING A SELECTION BOARD APPOINTED TO SELECT LINE OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE

The Secretary of the Navy
Admiral

From:
To:

Project concerning a selection board for the re-
commendation of officers of the line of navy on
active duty for temporary promotion to the grade
of rear admiral

Subject:

1. A selection board is hereby appointed, consisting of
yourself as president and the following additional and alter-
nate members, viz:

.....
shall act only upon the cases of officers not restricted by
law in the performance of duty and officers designated for
special duty; shall act only upon the
cases of officers designated for engineering duty and
shall act only upon the cases of officers
designated for administrative engineering duty.

2. will act as recorder.

3. The board is hereby convened at convene at the Navy De-
partment, Washington, D. C., on at ten o'clock
a.m., or as soon thereafter as may be practicable.

4. The Chief of Naval Personnel, acting for the Secretary
of the Navy, shall furnish the board with the names and re-
sords of all line officers eligible for consideration for
temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral and with
the names of all eligible officers not restricted by law in
the performance of duty who are in the promotion zone in the
grade under consideration for temporary promotion.

5. From among those officers not restricted by law in the
performance of duty who are eligible for consideration for
temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, the board
may recommend officers. Officers holding perma-
nent appointments in the Regular Navy who are recommended for

temporary promotion by the board shall be those officers whom it considers best fitted for such temporary promotion; officers not holding permanent appointments in the Regular Navy who are recommended for temporary promotion by the board shall be those officers whom it considers qualified for continued active duty.

6. From among those officers designated for engineering duty who are eligible for consideration for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, the board may recommend From among those officers designated for aeronautical engineering duty who are eligible for consideration for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, the board may recommend From among those officers designated for special duty who are eligible for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral, the board may recommend Officers who are designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty or special duty who are recommended for temporary promotion by the board shall be those officers whom it considers best fitted for such temporary promotion, based upon their comparative fitness, within such categories, for the duties prescribed for them by law.

7. No officer shall be recommended by the board for continuation on the active list.

8. In order to insure correct interpretation of medical records, the board may avail itself of the testimony of the Surgeon General of the Navy or of such other medical experts in the Navy as it may desire.

9. The following oath or affirmation shall be administered to the recorder by the president of the board:

"You, - - -, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that you will keep a true record of the proceeding of this board."

The following oath or affirmation shall then be administered by the recorder to the members of the board:

"You, and each of you, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that you will, without prejudice or partiality, and having in view both the special fitness

of officers and the efficiency of the naval
service; hence the action imposed upon
you as provided by law.

10. The proceedings of the board shall be conducted, less-
for as may be possible, in accordance with the provisions
of the Naval Regulations, Manual for Courts-Martial, United
States, (date).

11. The report of the board shall be in writing, with
names of the officers recommended for promotion entered in
the handwriting of the recorder, shall be signed by all the
acting members thereof, and shall certify:

(a) That the board has carefully considered the
case of every officer whose name was pre-
sented to the board by the Secretary of the Navy.

(b) That in the opinion of at least two-thirds
of the acting members, the officers described
in paragraph 2 above having performed ap-
pointments in the Regular Navy are selected
as the best fitted to assume the duties of
the next higher grade.

(c) That in the opinion of at least two-thirds of
the acting members, the officers described in
paragraph 2 above who are not held permanent
appointments in the Regular Navy are selected
as qualified for continued active duty in the
next higher grade.

(d) That in the opinion of at least two-thirds of
the acting members, the officers designated
for engineering duty, aeronautical engineer-
ing duty or special duty who are recommended
for temporary promotion, are selected as best
fitted to assume the duties of the next higher
grade, based upon their competitive fitness,
ability and character, and the duties pre-
scribed for them by law.

12. The proceedings of the board shall be reported by the
commander of the board and by the recorder as confidential.

The recommendations of the board shall be regarded by the members of the board and by the recorder as confidential until approved by the President. Upon completion of its proceedings, but not before ten (10) full days have elapsed, the board shall forward the record of its proceedings to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

/s/

(Secretary of the Navy)

The recommendations of the Board shall be forwarded by the members of the Board and by the recorder as confidentially approved by the President. Upon completion of the proceedings, but not before ten (10) full days have elapsed, the Board shall forward the record of its proceedings to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

(Secretary of the Navy)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Asbury, N. G., and Staff. Personnel Administration at the Executive Level. Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute, 1948. 45 pp.

Baker, Helen. Company Plans for Employee Promotion. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University, 1939. 48 pp.

Benge, Eugene J. Job Evaluation and Merit Rating. Deep River, Conn.: National Foremen's Institute, 1941. 198 pp.

Bethel, Lawrence L., Franklin S. Atwater, George H. E. Smith, and Harvey A. Stackman, Jr. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950. 822 pp.

Conference Board. Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 107. Company Programs of Executive Development. New York: NICB, 1950. 64 pp.

Davis, Ralph C. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940. 636 pp.

Davis, Ralph C. The Fundamentals of Top Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. 810 pp.

Evans, J. J. Jr. A Program for Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945. 95 pp.

Farnbacher, John M. An Analysis of the Training and Development of Senior Industrial Executives. Unpublished M. S. thesis. The Ohio State University, 1948. 60 pp.

Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management. Translated by Constance Storrs. New York: Pitman, 1949. 110 pp.

Freeman, G. L., and E. K. Taylor. How to Pick Leaders. New York: Funk & Wagnalls in association with Modern Industry Magazine, 1950. 226 pp.

Gowin, Enoch B. The Selection and Training of the Business Executive. New York: Macmillan, 1918. 225 pp.

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

General Introduction by J. B. and J. B. 1

Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936. 516 pp.

Halsey, George D. Making and Using Industrial Service Ratings. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944. 148 pp.

Holden, Paul E., Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith. Top Management Organization and Control. Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1949. 239 pp.

Jucius, Michael J. Personnel Management. Chicago: Irwin, 1951. 728 pp.

Knowles, Asa S., and Robert D. Thomson. Management of Manpower. New York: Macmillan, 1943. 241 pp.

Lytle, Charles W. Job Evaluation Methods. New York: Ronald, 1946. 314 pp., Chapter 12, "Merit Rating," pp. 231-259.

Mace, Myles L. The Growth and Development of Executives. Boston: Harvard University, 1950. 200 pp.

McCormick, Charles Perry. The Power of People. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 136 pp.

Personnel Handbook. Edited by John F. Mee. New York: Ronald, 1951. 1144 pp., Section 6 "Merit Rating," pp. 281-349.

Pigors, Paul, and Charles A. Myers. Personnel Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947. 510 pp.

Preston, Harley O. The Development of a Procedure for Evaluating Officers in the United States Air Force. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: American Institute for Research, 1948. 67 pp.

Probst, John B. Measuring and Rating Employee Value. New York: Ronald, 1947. 159 pp.

Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance. Edited by M. Joseph Docher and Vivienne Marquis. New York: AMA, 1950. 192 pp.

Chandler, A. J. Psychosomatic Medicine. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1936. 216 pp.

Glaser, George V. Making and Using Industrial Service. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944. 144 pp.

Goldman, Paul E., Leachman, S. V. and Robert L. South, Top Management Organization and Control. Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1947. 220 pp.

Johnson, Michael J. Personnel Management. Chicago: Irwin, 1951. 750 pp.

Kaplan, A. H., and Robert E. Thompson. Management of Personnel. New York: Macmillan, 1947. 741 pp.

Lewis, Charles W. The Industrial Revolution. New York: Ronald, 1944. 314 pp., Chapter 15, "Social Change," pp. 631-657.

Moore, W. L. The Growth and Development of Industry. Boston: Harvard University, 1950. 200 pp.

Robinson, Charles F. The Power of People. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 130 pp.

Robinson, Charles F. Personnel Management. Edited by John F. Moore. New York: Ronald, 1951. 1144 pp., Section 6 "Social Change," pp. 631-657.

Robinson, Charles F., and Charles A. Smith. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947. 210 pp.

Robinson, Charles F. The Development of a Laboratory for Personnel Research in the United States. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: American Institute for Research, 1948. 61 pp.

Robinson, John E. Personnel and Social Change. New York: Ronald, 1951. 130 pp.

Robinson, John E. Personnel and Social Change. Edited by H. J. Lippitt and Vincent Harding. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950. 102 pp.

Samples, Wayne G. A Study of Rating Methods for Professional Employees. Unpublished M.A. thesis. The Ohio State University, 1948. 97 pp.

Scott, Walter Dill, Robert C. Clothier, and William R. Spriegel. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949. 631 pp.

Symonds, Percival M. Diagnosing Personality and Conduct. New York: Century, 1931. 569 pp., Chapter III, "Rating Methods," pp. 41-114.

Tead, Ordway. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951. 223 pp.

Tead, Ordway, and Henry C. Metcalf. Personnel Administration. McGraw-Hill, 1920. 516 pp.

Tiffin, Joseph. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948. 530 pp.

Yoder, Dale. Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. 856 pp.

ARTICLES

Bingham, W. V. "Halo Invalid and Valid." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXIII, 1939, pp. 221-228.

Bittner, Reign H. "Developing an Industrial Merit Rating Procedure," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 1, 1948. pp. 403-432.

Bradshaw, Francis F. "American Council on Education Rating Scale: Its Reliability, Validity, and Use," Archives of Psychology, No. 119, 1930. 80 pp.

Bradshaw, Francis F. "Revising Rating Techniques," Personnel Journal, Vol. 10, 1931-32. pp. 232-245.

Carlson, Dick. "Employee Improving Rating Method," Personnel Journal, Vol. 19, 1940-41. pp. 364-367.

Cleeton, G. U. "Rating Executive Qualities," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 23, March 1947. pp. 321-326.

Shupliak, Wayne G. A Study of Rating Methods for Personnel Appraisals. Unpublished M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1945. 27 pp.

Steele, Walter Dill, Robert C. Giesinger, and William R. Spitzberg. Personnel Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1947. 631 pp.

Stevens, Frederick W. Comparative Personality and Group. New York: Grune, 1931. 309 pp., Chicago Ill., "Bartlett's Methods", pp. 41-114.

Todd, Orin. The Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931. 213 pp.

Todd, Orin, and Henry D. Wessell. Personnel Administration. McGraw-Hill, 1930. 216 pp.

Tiffin, Joseph. Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948. 230 pp.

Tucker, Lyle. Personnel Management and Industrial Relations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949. 650 pp.

ARTICLES

Bingham, W. V. "Scale Invariant and Valid." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. XXII, 1937, pp. 221-223.

Bishop, Helen M. "Developing an Industrial Rating Scale." Personnel Psychology, Vol. 1, 1948, pp. 403-430.

Brookman, Herman P. "American Council on Education Rating Scale: The Reliability, Validity, and Use." Journal of Psychology, No. 119, 1940, 80 pp.

Brookman, Herman P. "Rating Rating Techniques." Personnel Journal, Vol. 10, 1931-32, pp. 232-233.

Carson, Elmer. "Employee Improving Rating Method." Personnel Journal, Vol. 19, 1940-41, pp. 264-267.

Clouston, G. W. "Rating Executive Qualities." Personnel, Vol. 62, March 1947, pp. 321-326.

Collins, R. S., and A. Winn. "Making Merit Rating More Objective," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 28, No. 2, September 1951. pp. 154-161.

Driver, R. S. "Training as a Means of Improving Employee Performance Rating," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 18, No. 6, May 1942, pp. 364-370.

Dudycha, George J. "A Note on Halo Effect in Ratings," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 15, 1942. pp. 331-333.

Ellerd, Harvey G. "Rating Supervisors," Production Executive Series No. 42, AMA, 1926. pp. 3-18.

Fear, Richard A. "Employee Selection for the Average Company," Personnel Series No. 100, AMA, 1946. pp. 3-13.

Ferguson, Leonard W. "The L.O.M.A. Merit Rating Scales," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 3, 1950. pp. 193-216.

Flanagan, John C. "Defining the Requirements of the Executive's Job," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 28, No. 1, July 1951. pp. 28-35.

Foreman, Charles W. L. "Inventory, Planning, and Development of the Management Organization," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, Nos. 4 and 5, January and March 1951. pp. 267-276, 403-413.

Haight, H. W. "Case Studies in Executive Development: I," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 1, July 1950. pp. 19-24.

Hersey, Rexford. "Individualized Executive Selection, Training, and Follow-Up," Personnel Series No. 89, AMA, 1945. pp. 3-23.

"How Brown-Forman's Juniors are Qualifying Themselves for Promotion," Sales Management, Vol. 66, April 1, 1951. pp. 37-39.

Knauff, Edwin B. "A Classification and Evaluation of Personnel Rating Methods," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 31, 1947. pp. 617-625.

Gellman, R. S., and A. Wynn. "Rating scales for the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 2, December 1951. pp. 152-161.

Heffert, F. G. "The use of a rating scale in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 6, May 1952. pp. 364-370.

Hogwood, George J. "A study on rating scales in industry." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 12, 1932. pp. 231-233.

Kilmer, Harvey G. "Rating procedures." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 3-10.

Kurtz, Richard A. "Employee selection for the company." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 1-12.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Levenson, Leonard W. "Defining the requirements of the executive's job." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 38-39.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Levenson, Leonard W. "The use of rating scales in the assessment of performance." Personnel, Vol. 58, No. 1, January 1951. pp. 133-136.

Knauff, Edwin B. "Construction and Use of Weighted Check-List Rating Scales for Two Industrial Situations," Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 32, 1948. pp. 63-70.

Locke, Norman. "Employee Ratings," Personnel Journal, Vol. 21, 1942-43. pp. 282-288.

Mandell, Milton M. "Problems in Executive Selection," Advanced Management, March 1952. pp. 14-18.

Mandell, Milton M. "Research Findings in the Field of Supervisory and Executive Selection," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 3, November 1950. pp. 215-216.

McMurry, Robert N. "Is It Management's Fault that so Many Salesman Fail?" Sales Management, August 15, 1951. pp. 37-39, 106-109.

Muller-Thym, Bernard J., and Melvin E. Salveson. "Developing Executives for Business Leadership," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 25, No. 4, January 1949. pp. 250-260.

Planty, Earl G. "Case Studies in Executive Development: II," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 1, July 1950. pp. 25-28.

Reilley, Ewing, W., and Bernard J. Muller-Thym. "Executive Development Today for Increased Profits Tomorrow," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 24, No. 6, May 1948. pp. 401-412.

Richardson, M. W. "Forced Choice in Industry," The American Psychologist, Vol. 4, 1949. p. 278 (abstract).

Richardson, M. W., and G. F. Kuder. "Making a Merit Rating Scale that Measures," Personnel Journal, Vol. 12, 1933-34. pp. 36-40.

Ryan, Thomas A. "Merit Rating Criticized," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 24, 1945-46. pp. 6-15.

Sargent, D. S. "Top Management Policies and Philosophy: Appraising Executive Performance," General Management Series No. 133, AMA, 1945. pp. 16-25.

[illegible]

Sisson, E. Donald. "Forced Choice, the New Army Rating," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 1, 1948. pp. 365-381.

Spicer, L. G. "A Survey of Merit Rating in Industry," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 6, May 1951. pp. 515-518.

Staff, Personnel Research Section, AGO. "The Forced Choice Technique and Rating Scales," American Psychologist, Vol. 1, 1946. p. 267 (abstract).

Tiffin, Joseph. "Merit Rating: Its Validity and Techniques," Personnel, Series No. 100, AMA, 1946. pp. 14-23.

Uhrbrock, Richard S. "The Standardization of 724 Merit Rating Statements," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 3, 1950. pp. 285-316.

Webster, E. C., A. Winn, and J. A. Oliver. "Case Study of Merit Rating Forms: Simplification and Reduction of Traits for Raters," Personnel, AMA, Vol. 27, No. 5, March 1951. pp. 414-423.

Whyte, William H., Jr. "The Corporation and the Wife," Fortune, November 1950. pp. 109-111, 150 ff.

Wortham, Mary Harper. "Rating of Supervisors," Industrial Relations Section Bulletin No. 11, California Institute of Technology, 1944. 52 pp.

U.S. National Archives, Vol. 1, 1978, pp. 100-101.

[illegible]

Vol. 1, 1966, p. 107 (abstract).
Choice Technology and Design, "European Technology",
1967, Technical Research Center, 400, "The World"

William Joseph "Boss" Walling, for violence and fraud.
 "Boss" Walling, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913,

pp. 261-262.
Eating Habits, Richard S. "The Identification of the Food"
 Underwood, Richard S. "The Identification of the Food"

[illegible]

WYATT, William H., Jr. The Proposition and the Will.
New York, November 1960. 10-111. 150 ff.

Los Angeles Times, 1947, 52 no.
Civil Liberties Council Bulletin No. 11, California Institute
Research, Army Report, "Bureau of Supervisors," 1948-



1787
The following is a list of the
names of the persons who
were present at the
meeting of the
Committee on the
11th of May 1887.

Alfred
H. H. H.
H. H. H.

The first part of the paper is devoted to a study of the
 properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$
 where a_n are the coefficients of the power series. It is shown that
 the function $f(x)$ is entire and that its growth is of order
 ρ and type σ . The second part of the paper is devoted to a study of
 the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$
 where a_n are the coefficients of the power series. It is shown that
 the function $f(x)$ is entire and that its growth is of order
 ρ and type σ . The third part of the paper is devoted to a study of
 the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n!} x^n$$
 where a_n are the coefficients of the power series. It is shown that
 the function $f(x)$ is entire and that its growth is of order
 ρ and type σ .

Thesis 3 JANG

R58

Rittenhouse

1 17173

An evaluation of merit
ratings as a factor in the
promotion of Naval officer
to the top management
level

DE 959	9979
AP 1163	10814
DE 663	13556
12 JUL 65	14168
15 MAY 67	15008
	16807

Thesis

17173

R58

Rittenhouse

An evaluation of merit rating
as a factor in the promotion of
Naval officers to the top
management level.



thesR58

An evaluation of merit rating as a facto



3 2768 001 91374 2

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY